

THE
DIVINE PURITY
DEFENDED.

OR

A Vindication of some *Notes* concerning *God's Decrees*, especially of *Reprobation*, from the Censure of D. Reynolds in his *Epistolary Præface* to *Mr. Barlee's Correptory Correction*.

By THOMAS PIERCE, Rector of *Brington*.

The Second Edition.

He that is First in his own cause seemeth Just; But another cometh and findeth him out. Prov. 18. 17.

LONDON,

Printed by S. Griffin, for Richard Royston at the *Angel*
in *Ivie-Lane*, 1659.



The Introduction.

I*T* having been wonder'd at by some, and expostulated by others, why having finished these papers so many Moneths since, and fully prepared them for the Press, I should have carried my self towards them with so much indifference and neglect, as to have laid them quite aside like things forgotten & out of mind, not vouchsafing them the Freedom to enjoy the End of their Conception, I am moved now at last to pay my Reader that little Debt, which my voluntary Promise hath made his Due; To wit, a survey of that Epistle, which was prefixed, by D. Reynolds, to Mr. Barlee's Satyre. And to the making of this Survey, I was somewhat more Invited, by the remarkable Difference, which I observed, betwixt that Adversary, and This. For in my former Defensative, I was enforced to wipe off many Personal Aspersions, which was a very unpleasing and irksom Task; whereas now having to do with a Nobler Adversary, who is less apt to lead me from the subject matter of our Debate, I cannot choose but think it a happy change, and suppose that my Reader will think so too, as that which affords us so much more both of ease, and pleasure.

But this is not all. For I cannot but hold my self obliged (that I may not say Invited only) to plead as boldly

The Introduction.

ly and as publickly in the behalf of sound Doctrines, as other men have adventured to plead against them. I say, I hold my self obliged by these ensuing Consideratiōs.

First, the Merit of those Doctrines for which I plead; which seem to me to be Doctrines of so great moment & importance, that according as the subjects about which they are conversant, are either truly or falsely stated, they are apt to shed either the best or the worst kind of Influence upon our Lives. The summe of that which I contend for is briefly this. "That the God of Heaven
 " hath not appointed any Creature to do wickedly, but
 " hateth sin with an unfeigned & perfect Hatred, &
 " doth not give a necessity to all Events, but to those
 " alone which are agreeable to his Holiness, and are
 " the objects of his absolute unconditional Decree;
 " That God's Decree of Reprobatiō was eternally re-
 " spective, & respective of sins as well actual, as origi-
 " nal; That Gods Decree of Election was eternally re-
 " spective of our being in Christ, and of our abiding
 " in him unto the end; That God's Execution of his
 " Decrees are in a just Conformity to his Decrees; That
 " Jesus Christ is a General, but a Conditional Savi-
 " our, a Saviour to all who do the duties by him requi-
 " red, to none without it; That they who stand may
 " fall for ever, and must therefore very watchfully
 " * take heed lest they fall, ever giving all * dili-
 " gence to make their Calling and Election sure;
 " These, I say, are the Doctrines that I contend for, and
 " the most necessary Doctrines by which to disabuse
 " the Understanding, wheresoever we attempt to reform
 " the Will. And I do rather choose to hazard some loss of
 " Time, as well as Labour, in the possible fruitlesnesse
 " of my Attempt, than to be guiltily sparing of my Endeavours, to rescue the lives and Conversations of certain
 " seduced

* John 15. 2, 6.

Math. 24. 11.

1 Cor. 10. 12.

1 Tim. 4. 1.

* 2 Peter 1. 10

Heb. 12. 15.

The Introduction.

seduced and injur'd Men, whom the
 * *contrary Doctrines and Opinions*
are wont to carry into Debauches. For
though I cannot but acknowledge with
Joy and Comfort, that through the Grace
and Mercy of our God, many Men of
ill Opinions have yet been men of good
Lives, and have been marvelously
restrained from those Errors of Pra-
ctice to which those Errors of Judgement had else so
naturally betrayed them; yet when I seriously consider,
of how great a number, how few they are, and what
multitudes on the contrary both of Stoicks and Ma-
homedans, of Marcionites and Manichees, of Gno-
sticks and Ranters, & other visible Sectaries (who are
a professors of Christianity, and even Pretenders to
Reformation,) *have ascribed their blackest and most*
frightful Deeds, not to the passive permission or for-
bearance only, but to the active Providence and to the
absolute Decrees of God Almighty, (who is of * *pur-*
er eyes than to behold evil, & cannot look on Ini-
quity, saith the Prophet Habakkuk,) *I think it the*
Duty of every Christian to be so zealously concern'd
for the Glory and Reputation of his Creator, and so
tenderly affected towards the Interest of souls, as not
only to shake off the venomous fruits, nor only to lop off
the cursed Branches, but to lay his Axe to the Root of
this Tree of Evil; and so to free his own ^b *soul, what-* ^b *Ezek. 33:9.*
ever Influence he may have upon other mens.

Secondly, It ought to be one of my Inducements,
that He who publicly assaulted the Truth, and Me, in
his Elaborate Epistle to Mr. Barlee, is a person of great
Authority, as well as Fame, amongst the men of that
way, which it is my Duty to write against. Who by
approving

* Cum de Impietatibus arguuntur,
 non aliud se agere prætendunt quàm
 quod à Deo ordinati sunt, & sua
 Prædestinationi repugnare non
 posse dicant. -- Christianorum No-
 men sibi vindicantes reipsà à
 Christianismo alieniores sunt,
 quàm sint ulli Ethnici. Cuthbert
 Tonsil Episc. Dunel. contra im-
 pios Blasphematores Dei Præde-
 stinationis, Cap. 1. p. 22, & 23.

a ὁ ἐν ὀνόματι
 [Χριστιανῶν] ὁ
 ἐπαινος ἢ κα-
 λασίς οὐκ αὖ
 δὲ λόγος ἁπο-
 στο. Justin. Mar-
 τυρ. Ἀπολογία.
 δὲ. σελ. ΑΨ. α.
 page 42.

* Habak. 1. 13.

The Introduction.

approving and abetting the very worst of those Doctrines, which were delivered by Mr. Barlee, and by his Masters before him, may possibly give them some Reputation with that sort of Readers, with whom I am more of all desirous to bring those Errors into Disgrace. It is not safe for the people to be intrusted with the Fawlings of so eminent a person as D. Reynolds. For what He dictates, they may swallow down whole, neither examining the Ingredients whereof it is compounded, nor what kind of nourishment 'tis apt to breed. And hence I think it extremely useful, to give an account ~~at~~ ^{and} of what it hath pleased him to publish concerning the Points under Debate, for the better undeceiving of Those especially, who are in danger to be mis-led by so great a Name.

Thirdly, I do conceive it no less than Duty, to make one reflection upon my self, when I find my self accused to all the world of having wrongfully charged such men with Blasphemy, who were "eminent Servants of Jesus Christ, and deeply acquainted with the mind of God. A Heavy Crime without Question; of which, if my Accuser is able to prove that I am guilty, whatever mercy I may have from others, I will shew but little upon my self. If I have wrong'd those Writers whom he so zealously commendeth, or have spoken of them more severely than some of their own dear Brotherhood are made appear to have done, I will be avenged upon my self, as far as mine Adversary can wish me. But the willinger he is to have it thought that I am guilty, it doth concern me so much the more to make it known that I am Innocent. Nor will it cost me any more Pains to do this thoroughly and with effect, than by desiring my Readers Patience, and his Impartiality. For first admit it were so, that none
of

The Introduction

of those writers whom I accused had ever writtē any such thing, as that God is the Author and Cause of sin ; a ἡθεὶς ὁ θεός
ἀποκρίνεται, &c.
Iren. in Epist.
ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχι-
επισκόπου, p. 510.
b εἰ τὴν τοιοῦτον
ἡμετέρον, &c.
Euseb. Hist.
Eccles. l. 5. c. 20.
c Silentium no-
strum Reatus
docebitur, &
Taciturnitas vi-
debitur esse con-
sensus. In Præ-
fat. p. 12.
d Concil. Sec-
und. Arausic.
cap. 1. Can. 25.
e Bib. Fat. Gr.
Vol. 2: p. 286.
l. 15, 16, 17, 18
Consule Ni-
cetas (de me-
re qui nunc ob-
servabitur cum
quis à sava-
cenismo ad no-
stram Fidem
transfugerit)
ex l. 2. The-
sauri Ortho-
doxæ frag-
mentum, In
Bibl. Patr. Gr.
excus. Parisiis,
1624.
f Vin. Gra. l. 1.
part. 1. Digr. 6.
Sect. 4. c. 1.
p. 92, &c.
g Philip. Mel-
ancth. in loc.
de Causâ Pec-
catorum p. 48.
uncondi-

The Introduction.

h Nic. Hem-
mingius de
Prædest c. 1.
de viâ vitæ
c. 5. In Syntag.
Instit. Christi.
loc. 28, &c.
i Nulli Nece-
ssitatem impos-
uerit ut malus
esset, & aliud
esse non posset.
Hoc enim si fe-
cisset, (quod
absit de ejus
Bonitate senti-
re.) Ipse utiq;
esset Author
Malorum, &c.
Remig. Ludg.
Reg 5 in Hist.
Gottschalki.
cap. 11 p. 173.
k βέβαιον κατὰ
ἐκείνους μὴ
αὐτῶν, ἢ τὰ αὐτῶν
τὸν θεὸν ἀνέχεσθαι
δὲ ἑμῶς. Chr.
Edit. Savil.
t. 4. p. 745.
l Confer. at
Hampr. Court.
p. 29.
m lb. p. 30, 31.
n Iddio non è,
ne può essere
Autore, ne ca-
gione della
malveger à del-
la sua Creatu-
ra Deodate in
Prov. 16. 4.
o In Præfat. ad
Artic. falsò si-
bi Impositos.
p Ad object.
Gall, Capit 7.

unconditional Prædestination) almost as often as he speaks of it) by such disgracefulⁿ phrases, as Parcarum Tabulæ, and Fatum Stoicum, and affirms it mischievous to the manners of men, as well as blasphemous against God; If ⁱ Remigius Lugdunensis and the greatest Favourers of Gottschalk, and Dr. Whittaker himself, with our late most learned and Reverend Frimate of Armagh, did count it an evident and an horrible blaspheming against God, to say He imposeth upon his Creatures any Necessity of sinning; (yet by how many, and noted Men, how often, and how publickly hath that been said?) If S. ^k Chrysostom thought it better to be ten thousand times buried, than that God should hear any such word because of us; If Bish. Bancroft at Hampton Court, with the good liking of King James, did call it ^l a Desperate Doctrine of Prædestination, from whence King James was of opinion that ^m a desperate Presumption might be arreared, by inferring the necessary Certainty of standing & persisting in Grace; If learned Deodate of Geneva did so much abhor the ascribing unto God the least Causality of sin, as not to allow a ⁿ possibility of his being so much as the occasion of it; In a word, If St. ^o Austin, and ^p Prosper, and divers others whom I shall mention [Chapter 4. §. 5. & 6. & 7.] were as deeply concerned as I have been, and much more pungent in their Expressions; Then why should I have been charged, in so high a Degree as I have been, for having been jealous of God's Honour as well as They, and equally zealous for his Glory, who is my Redeemer, as well as Theirs? If I have met with such writers who pretending to be godly, as well as learned, have sent those Doctrines to be printed, and left for lessons to Posterity, which have not only made God

The Introduction.

God to be the Author of sin, even in those very words, but also in all other words in which an Author can be exprest, and even in many more words than can be used (with any Truth) of any Reprobates whatsoever, whether Men, or Devils, whereby to charge them with the sins of such as are ensnared by their Seducements, why should any Man condemn me for the natural effects of my Resentment? If my Reverend Assailant may be allowed to be a publick Defender of those very Doctrines which are condemned by Holy Scripture, by the publick reason of the Church throughout all Ages, and by the private reason all the world (excepting the Sectaries themselves who have been the Authors or Fautors of them) as destructive to the purity & to the verity of the Godhead; with how much a greater force of reason must I be allowed (if not commanded) to assert the purity of his Goodness against the daring-nesses of men, who carry their life in their Nostrils, & whose Foundatio is in the Dust? If ^r Paul & Barnabas on such an occasion would have torn their hair from off their heads; Nay, if a Jewish High Priest would have rent his Garment upon the hearing of any sentence reproachfully spoken against his God; Nay, if the Heathen man^r Plato would not have any one to live in a well order'd City, who should say or hear (with any patience) any such horrible affirmations, as that God doth Predestin or Decree the moral evils of his Creatures, why then should a Christian be less Religious? Nay if ^u Vedelius, and his ^w Followers, have affirmed those Doctrines to be so perfectly essential to Religion it self, that we cannot be Advocates for God but at the peril of being Atheists, how can we choose but look upon them as on the worshippers of Hermes, who thought that to hurle stones at him, was the godliest

^r They ran in as among the people, crying out, and saying, sirs, why do ye these things? Acts 13 14, 15. ^s That was the high Priest's Custom when read Blasphemy was spoken, as well as when he falsely supposed it such. Matt. 26. 65: ^t Plato in secundo Libro, ^u Vedelius in Arcan. Arminianismi, Cap. 10 ^w Correp. Cor. p. 54, 55, 118:

The Introduction.

Instance of their Devotion? Let my Reader carry in his mind from the beginning to the ending of what I have or shall publish, as well for whom, as against what, my pleadings are, And then I shall demand no other favour. If He that strook at the Father did force the * Dumb Child to speak, who but for that provocation had liv'd in silence, it must needs be difficult for me, whose provocations were so much greater, to keep myself from an outcry against the Persecutors of Heaven, and bold Invaders of Immortality, who, but for that sollicitation, had never once appeared upon these Subjects.

Fourthly, I do consider I am in Duty both to God, & to my self, and perhaps to some of my Brethren also, to lay to heart the Nature of true Repentance, which doth import an endeavour of Restitution, and (in some degree) of satisfaction, as well as Grief. It is not enough to cry Peccavimus in our Closets, or to shed some Tears behind the Door, as Peter did when he repented; but we must imitate St. Peter in that better effect of his Contrition, his peaching publicly for Christ, because he had privately deny'd him. I cannot but think myself admonish'd by the words of Christ to St. Peter, [y when Thou art converted, strengthen thy Brethren.] Had I never been misled into the contrary opinion, I had never been concerned so much for this. But having found by sad experience, that the same Errors in Judgement which made me strain sometimes at Gnats, did also teach me to swallow Camels, I cannot choose but be desirous to do some good with my Misfortunes. Sure I am, I am the better for them my self; for had I not dangerously erred, I had not valued my safety, as now I do. If Saint Gregorie's Exclamation may be allowed of, (as intended onely to celebrate

κ'Οψ πνις β.
πας ο απανθ
επαντα φανω
επι β, "Αν
θραν, μη
κτερε Κεσι-
ω. Herodor.
l. i. c. 85 p. 36

y Luke 22. 32.

Mat. 23. 24.

O felix Culpa
quæ talem ac-
tantum meruit
habere Re-
demptorem!
Gregor.

The Introduction.

celebrate *the* Depth of Gods Mercy, and *not* the Dignity of Adams sin,) *then perhaps I may say, It is good for me to have Erred, because, I hope, it is good for others. There being nothing in this world which I do covet with more sincerity, or more heartily contend for in all my Prayers, then that the means of my cure may be to others for prevention; that they who hate me the most may be profited the most by my Endeavours, and that my Readers in general (which way soever they stand affected) may reap the Benefit, and the fruit both of my Dangers, and my Escape:*

There is yet a Fifth Reason of this my Enterprise, which being pertinently rendred in the 1. Section of my Fourteenth Chapter by way of answer to one passage in D. Reynolds his Conclusion (to which I think it sufficient that I at once direct and refer the Reader,) I shall not take any occasion to lengthen a tedious Introduction, but admit as many as are furnish't with sufficient Patience or Curiosity, to the immediate perusal of that which follows:



The General Contents of the several Chapters.

CHAP. I.

D. R. His Thanks to the *Correptory Corrector*. His way of Civility to *T. P.* and the truth.

CHAP. II.

King *James* his Censure of *Bertius*, and *Arminius*, and Presbyterianism it self, which was *Arminius* his worst Qualification. The True Cause of the Distempers in the Belgick Nation, not *Arminius*, but the other Presbyterians who were more Heterodox than He.

CHAP. III.

A Vindication of *Tit. I. 13.* from strange Misconstruction. No Necessity of ill Language from one Minister to another. The Reviler is encouraged, but ought not. The Advise for soft words, and hard Arguments, How observed by Him that gives it.

CHAP. IIII.

Two sorts of Blasphemers. *D. R.* his Application to *Mr. Calvin*, and *Doct. Twisse*. A survey of the Doctrines accused of Blasphemy. Proofs that they are Blasphemous in the highest degree, as striking at the Purity, and Holiness of God, and by consequence at his Essence, by affirming him to be the *Author* of *sin*, not only in *that* very
Term,

The Contents.

Term, but also in all other *Terms* in which an *Author* can be expressed, and in *Terms* much worse. Evidences, that *Doctrines* less *hainous*, have been alwayes branched with the name of Blasphemies, as well by the *Antient* as *Modern Writers* of the *Church*, from *Apostolical Times* to this day. Catalogues of Examples. One from the *Principal Patrons* pretended to by that *Party*. Dr. *Reynolds* his *Partiality* to one party, and his *Injurious usage* of the other unavoidably inferred. The *Marcionites*, *Manichees*, and *Carporations*, not so bad in their *Assertions*, as the modern *Teachers* of *irrespective Reprobation*. The unequal Comparison made by Dr. *Reynolds*, betwixt the *Case of Christ*, and of his *Party*.

CHAP. V.

Of Mr. *Calvin* and Dr. *Twisse*. How fairly treated by *T. P.* how sharply by others. How sharply others were treated by them, Mr. *Baxter's* Censure of Mr. *Pemle*, and Dr. *Twisse*, for their opinions.

CHAP. VI.

Dr. *Reynolds* his *Fallacy of Ignoratio Elenchi*. The disparity betwixt *T. P.* his usage of his *Friends*, and the *Massilians* or *Pelagians* usage of *Austin* and *Prosper*. These two *Fathers* calumniated by them that erred on the right hand, just as *T. P.* by those that have worse erred on the left. The *Author* of [*Gods love to Mankind*] vindicated. He formerly a *Calvinist* in the points now controverted, but his judgement changed upon weighty *Reasons*. *Prosper* and *Remigius* alleged quite besides the purpose.

CHAP. VII.

Dr. *Reynolds* his citing of divers *Writers*, who however of his *Party*, are both at *Enmity* amongst themselves, and destructive to the purpose for which he cites them, Mr. *Perkins*,

The Contents.

kins, Bp. Abbot, Maccovius, Dr. Twisse. Dr. Twisse for Mr. Perkins, Bp. Abbot against both. The Synod of Dort's thanks to *Monlin* for that which Dr. Twisse censur'd [as *Arminian*, & *Jesuitical*.] The Calvinists Doctrines suspected, and disowned, or owned only with Reluctancy, by the more discerning of their own party. The Remonstrants ill usage at Dort. *D. Reyn*, his flying from plain words to secret Intentions. An Implicit charge upon *Austin*. A Heavier on the *Scriptures*. The *Scriptures* vindicated from leading any into Blasphemies. The first Instance of *Joseph* and his Brethren against the purpose for which 'tis urged: All that follow quite besides it. That the verbs [*To harden, to blind, to deliver up, to send delusions, to deceive, &c.*] are by an ordinary Hebraism only permissive in signification, though active in sound. Proof from the verdict of all the Fathers; the confession of the chief Calvinists that all the Fathers do so expound them; the Judgement of *Austin*: the Adversaries Confession of *Austins* Judgement; the Judgement of *Melancthon*, *Du Plessis*, Bp. *Andrews*; and from other plain *Scriptures*. The Instance of *Shimei* cleared. They who made God the Author of the first sin that ever was, cannot pretend it to be the punishment of a Former sin. The only warrantable meaning of that saying, That God doth punish sin with sin, is Negative.

CHAP. VIII.

D. Reynolds his onser to the stating the Doctrine of Predestination. The Result, not what is, but what May-be without a Contradiction. His *Fallacie Plurium Interrogationum*. His very May-be disproved, by the Contradiction on which it is proved to imply. God's workings on the will *Hic & nunc ad unum*, a groundlesse Invention. Mr. *Baxter* for Free-will. *D. Reyn*. his confuting of no Adversary. His supposing God to work on the will by his creative Omnipotency implyeth a Contradiction. Of the will's determining it self. Fallacious arguing from the Power to the

The Contents

the *Act*. The Parable of the Talents in opposition to D. R. his *May-be*. Other *May-be's* produced, to shew how little is got by his. The several wayes of God's working *with several Creatures*.

CHAP. IX.

D. Reynolds his mistake from *Rom. 11. 33*. Gods Will is revealed in his Word, And plainly revealed against *absolute preterition* in *Adams Loyns*. This flatly *Injurious* to the Death of *Christ*, to the extent of his Love, and to the *sincerity of his Intentions*. D. Reynolds his tacit confession that the Doctrine is *unjustifiable* which T. P. contended against, but the other most true which He contended for.

CHAP. X.

D. Reynolds his 8. Propositions of no use to him, but the contrary. His best amounteth to a *May-be*. He disputes against himself, if all were granted which he desires touching *Man in Mass* & his being the *Object* of *Predestination*. His *Inconsistence* with the greatest *Pillars* of his own Party, who differ from him, and from each other. *Beza, Junius, Piscator, Dr. Twisse, Du Moulin*, all at odds with one another in stating the *Object of the Decree*. Nor is Mr. Calvin at unity with himself. Dr. Twisse his Argument overthroweth the *Sablasarian way* upon a principle which they grant him. His sharpness against the Doctrine of the Synod at *Dort*. D. Reynolds his 7th. position is the destruction of his 5th. as his 4th. was of his 3d. The worst effects of the worst Doctrine exemplified.

CHAP. XI.

D. Reynolds his last reserve of Forces least useful to him. The same matter in several Dresses. *Gratis dictum*. His arguing *à Potentia ad Actum*. His mistake of Free Election for irrespctive. Election respctive as well as Free. God's mercy over all his works, particularly over Infants. Why of the *all* that are called but *few* are chosen. D: Reyn. irreconcilable

The Contents

table with his Friend Mr. *Barlee*, whilst he plainly saith what *T. P.* did, (but in terms less wary) and so by consequence, a considerable part of Mr. *Barlee's* book is wholly spent against the *Doctrine* of Dr. *Reynolds*, and against his very words too. He comes not home to that which he had undertaken to excuse touching God's having to do in the production of sin.

CHAP. XII.

D. *R.* his confession of the *Grounds* which were the Basis of *T. P.* his *Superstructure*. His not pretending the least illegality in *T. P.* his Deductions from either of those *Grounds*. And so his granting the whole cause. His wrong Conjectures of *Cassianus*, and *Bradwardine*. *Prosper's* commendation of the *Semipelagians*. S. *Hillary* told *Austin*, that the *Masilians* held no more concerning Grace than they cited him for. *Pelagius*, and his Followers extremely commended by S. *Austin* as most excellent Christians.

CHAP. XIII.

B. *Andrews* vindicated, and compared with S. *Austin*. His Censure of the *Lambeth Articles* vindicated from the Negative Argument of D. *Reynolds*.

CHAP. XIII.

D. *Reynolds* his Confession, that his Assault made upon *T. P.* was more than was desired of him by Mr. *Barlee*. The Necessity he imposed on *T. P.* to make him this return. His great commendations of Mr. *Barlee's* Book examined, and refused, by a short specimen of the Doctrines contained in it. Particularly his Doctrine, that a child of God in acts of Murder and Adultery without repentance cannot be in a state of Damnation; and that David at his worst had not lost the Spirit of God. *Melancthon's* detestation of that Doctrine more than of any.

The Conclusion



The Divine purity Defended.

CHAP. I.

E. R.

*For his Reverend and worthy
Friend, Mr. WILLIAM BARLEE,
Minister of the word at Brock-
hole in Northamptonshire.*

Sir,

*I Return you many thanks for communicating unto
"me, your Elaborate and learned Answer to an
"Anonymous Book lately published concerning God's
"Decrees, reported to be written by one, whom, for his
"polite parts of wit and learning, I have and do
"respect; but have been long since taught a very good Arist. Eth. l. I:
"Rule by Aristotle, ἀμφοῖν ὅσον φίλοι ὅσον περιμᾶν τῷ 6.4.
"ἀληθείαν.*

T. P.

S. I.



*If the Corruptory Corrector is one of his
Reverend and worthy Friends, it is for my
Honour and advantage, not to be of their
Number. And if the Corruptory Correction
(with such sad Greek, such rufal Latin,
such Incongruities even of English, such
virulence & inventions as have been publicly discover'd) did
pass with the Author of this Epistle for no less than an Elab-*

B

orate

The Acrimony and Sharpnesse Chap. 2.

borate and learned Answer. It is matter to me of admiration, whether he read what he commended *before* he commended it, or only spake at a venture, but read it *not*. For if he read it in *good earnest* (as he professeth afterwards to have done) I admire his *Patience* very much, but very much more his *Partiality*; in that he could see, (or *oversee*) so many fruits of the flesh, and so much filthinesse of the Spirit, so many weaknesse of Reasoning, with such profound wants of Logick, and then be *thankful* for the perusal of (what he calleth) an *Elaborate and learned Piece*. But if he did *not* read what he commended, my admiration doth still increate; for he should neither have told us that he *did*, nor have commended what he did *not*. And therefore

§. 2. Secondly, As it affords me matter of wonder, so doth it also of *Humiliation*, to find my self thus commended for I know not what *Polite parts of wit and learning*, both in the very page, and by the very same *Pen*, by which the *Correptory Correptor* is so much prais'd. *Wit and Learning* are two things, of which I find I have lesse than a very ordinary proportion. The comfort is, I find a full supply in my Cause for the utmost Defects which I have discerned in my self. The very *Nakednesse* of the *Truth* is that alone which enables me to make it good. *Wit and Learning* are noxious weeds, till they are seasoned by *Grace*, and (by the sanctifying influence of *That*) attended with singlenesse and integrity. The highest glory and commendation (as I conceive) is to worship the God of Heaven in the sincerity of obedience; to be a man without guile; not to act, or design, or so much as imagine or wish mischief to any *Enemy*, much lesse to undermine or invade a *Neighbour*, by secret fraud, or open violence; but rather to suffer the greatest injury, than to offer the very least. A Heathen may be learned, an Atheist witty, and a Devil may be both in great Abundance. Mr. Barlee told me, more than once, that I had over-gallant parts, by the same Token that he told me, I was not a little proud of them. He (I say) would needs commend me for *Wit and Learning*, even in that very *Pasquil*, wherein he

he call'd me *Dragon*, and my innocent Book a *Noon-day-Devil*. So that my Reverend Aggressor, had he been pleas'd, might with my free leave, have profess'd his *De-spising* or *Accusing* of me, if he found nothing better to respect me for, than what he calls my *Wit* and *Learning*. When *Apelles* of *Macedon* comended *Taurion* to the King, or rather * traduced him with commendations (as the Historian words it) and that to no other purpose than to destroy him the more securely, by turning him out of his employment, Polybius tells us that he invented a * new way of callumniating; which was not by speaking ill, but by malignantly commending whom he design'd to hurt. Be it so, that *Apelles* was the Inventer of this Knack, and that Polybius did think it New; yet since the death of *Apelles*, it is (I suppose) two thousand years. And therefore now I may say, it is a very old, and an easie art, by commending him a little, whom we do afterwards intend to revile a great deal, to gain some credit to our Revilings. How Polybius hath censur'd such commendations, I have only related in my Margin, and not transmitted to the knowledge of English Readers, because his censure is so Severe. For no provocation shall ever tempt me to say the most that I am able against an Enemy. I wish it were a thing possible to defend my Self, and the Truth, without reflecting upon them, who have set themselves against Both. I am every where willing to put the fairest construction upon the words of my Assailant, and not the worst that they can bear. But what he meant by his *Oyl* and *Balsom* in the beginning of his attempt, he hath enforced me to feel by his *After-Blowes*. To make profession of respect (not for Honesty, or Truth, or Ingenuity of dealing) for profane polite parts of wit and learning, and presently after to accuse me of injuriously fixing the Name of *Blasphemy* upon the Doctrines of some men, whom he espouseth for their Opinions, when (as himself will confess upon his serious perusal of my

* ὁ Ψέγων, ἀλλ' ἐπαινῶν, τὸν ταυρίωνα διέλλαον.

* Καὶ οὕτως δὲ πρὸς ἐπαιτὶν τῶν πρὸ Διαβολῆς, τὸ μὴ ψέγειν, ἀλλ' ἐπαινεῖν, λυμαινόμενος τὸς πᾶσι, δι' ἧται ὁ μέγιστος καὶ φρόνως τοιαύτη κακωσύνη καὶ βασκανία καὶ δόλος, ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς διατείνοντων, καὶ τοῦ τῶν κατὰ ἀλλήλους ἐπιδοτιᾶς καὶ πλεονεξίας. Polyb. l. 4. p. 348. A B.

fourth chapter) I only called that *Blasphemy* which hath been ever so called, and is acknowledged to be *Blasphemy* by the ablest men of that party from whose publick writings it hath been cited, This I cannot but pronounce to be a very corroding and wounding Balsam. I would not for all the world be so unhappily polished with wit and learning, as my *Glycypicraus Assailant* would make the world beleieve I am. It is so far from being *gruesed*, or *pleasant* to me, to have my head thus broken with *Commendations*. But yet I will possesse my soul in patience, I will * *περὶς πόνου, μὴδ' ἀγανάκτην*, nay farther yet, I will endeavour to take some * pleasure in such afflictions, which I suffer for being sensible of dishonours done unto my God. When meer mortal men are pleaded for against me, in revenge of my having pleaded for God himself against men; when I am sullied as a *Bolsac*, (who is presumed to be of a foul complexion) meerly for proving that God is (a) *Pure*, and that he (b) cannot indure to behold *Iniquity*, that he cannot (c) away with it, that his soul doth (d) hate it, that 'tis a (e) trouble unto him, that he is (f) weary to bear it, that he will rather have (g) us dye, or be temporally undone, than commit it in the least measure when we are able to avoid it through him that (h) strengthens us, that he will punish it with (k) infinite and endlesse pains, (so far is he from decreeing, that men shall inevitably commit it, and suffer for it unavoidably through the necessity of such Decree;) when I am defamed, by no unpleasing man, as very scandalously erroneous, meerly for saying in effect, what St. Paul said before me, (l) Let God be true, and every man a liar, and every man a *Blasphemous* liar, who shall say (in contradiction to the true word of God) that God is the * *Willer, Ordainer, Predestiner, Decreeer, Necessitator, Author, and Cause of Sin*; When I say, I am a sufferer, for not enduring or suffering such things as these to seduce the People without controul, by making them *Libertines*, and *Atheists*, at least in practice, if not in judgement, and (as far as they have power, or opportunity) subverters of Government; and razers out of the distinction 'twixt Right and Wrong, which is the Foundation and the Cement of all Civil

* Pythag.

* 2 Cor. 12.

9, 10.

Rom. 5. 3.

Heb. 11. 25, 26

a Psal. 145. 17.

b Hab. 1. 13.

c Isa. 1. 13.

d Verse 14.

e Verse 14.

f Ibid. & Mal.

3. 17.

Isa. 7. 13.

g Mat. 10. 23.

Romans 3. 8.

h Philip. 4. 13.

k Mark 9. 44.

l Romans 3. 4.

* Who they are

that say thus,

and more than

thus, hath

been sufficient-

ly shewed, and

farther shall

be as occasion

serves. See

p. 9. 10. And

Divine Phi-

lanth. Defend.

l. 3. Sect 34 p.

132, top. 141.

SECT. 2, 3. of some Malandricks.

5

Civil society, I will endeavour to (*m*) rejoice in such my *m* sufferings. And sure in this present case of my being thus assaulted by Dr. Reynolds, I need not take any thought as to my personal concernment. For

m Mar. 5. 12.
Coloss. 1. 24.
2 Cor. 11. 30.
Hab. 10. 34.

§. 3. Thirdly, He hath used *me* no otherwise than he hath used the very *Truth*, which he commends and persecutes in the very same breath. I say he commends her in that Rule of Aristotle, That (*n*) truth is preferable to all other Friends. But then he persecutes her too, by giving thanks and commendations even to that very *Lictor*, who gave to truth, rather than *me*, such store of *Correptory* *Correption*; And by styling that *signal volume* no less than an *Elaborate* and *learned Answer*, which was so full of the most groundlesse and the most palpable (*o*) *Inventions*. It is not my *Accusation*, but the observation of the people, That Mr. Barlee's papers are gone abroad with the concurrence and approbation of Dr. Reynolds. And this partaking with the *Erroneous* must pass for *friendship* to the *Truth*, because a *Text* out of Aristotle is misapplied to make it good. The youngest birds peradventure may be caught with such chaff, till they are warned to consider, That never any man yet hath so contended for an error, as not at least to pretend a friendly preference of the *Truth*. *Truth* hath many great flatterers, but few true friends. To give her very good words, is cheap, and easie. But whether it is truth, or specious error, which my Reverend Adversary doth here prefer, our Impartial Reader will best discover by the following parts of his *Epistle*.

η Αρετή εν-
τοις φίλοις ο-
σον περιμα-
τω δαίμονα.

o See Divine
Philanth. de-
tended cap. 3
&c.

CHAP. II.

E. R.

King James
his Declarati-
on against Vor-
stius in his
works in Eng-
lish. p. 350. &
355.

"I was sorry to see this controversie revived amongst
"which caused antiently so much Trouble to the
"Church of God, & in our memory so much Danger
" & Distemper to the Belgick Nation : whereof
"King James was so sensible, that in a letter to the
"states he calleth Arminius an Enemy of God, &
"chargeth Bertius with grossly living against the
"Church of England, in avowing that the Here-
"sies contained in his blasphemous Book of the
"Apostacy of the Saints (they are the Kings own
"words.) were agreeable, with the Religion and
"profession of this Church, and he did solemnly desire
"the Embassadors of that state to forwarn them
"from him to beware of the Disciples of Arminius,
"of whom though himself lately dead, he had left
"too many behind him.

T. P.

§. 1. **I**T seems the Authority of King James is of great
weight with him ; And (since it hath made it his
own choise to imbue his Reader in the first place
with the judgements and censures of that wise King)
I am heartily glad to find it is so. For although that King
in his younger years had imbibed and suckt in, even before
he was aware, that Presbyterian opinion of the generizing
Scottish Kirk (which no man living will think strange who
knows the place of his Birth, and his Education,) yet in his
riper

riper and wiser years he found so great reason to retract and
 abjure his former error, that he readily accepted of *Bishop*
Montagues appeal, and commanded it to be printed, and to
 be dedicated also to his royal self, when even this was the
 Doctrine appealed for. [That the children of God may fall
 away, according to the Tenor of our sixteenth Article,] which
 faith, that [After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may
 depart from Grace given and fall into sin, and by the Grace of
 God we may rise again, and amend our lives.] Which the
King perceiving to be the words and mind of the * Church of
 England, and that *Bertius* had discerned it a great deal
 too near than himself, he did not think it below him to grow
 in Knowledge and Wisdom, as well as years. To forsake an
 error, & repent, is an ingenuous and valiant, as well as pious,
 nay farther, a glorious and Princely thing. Therefore *Me-*
lancthon was not ashamed to write against that opinion
 which he had formerly been of. And my contemptible self,
 till I was Master of Arts of half a years standing, was as
 fully, if not as fiercely, of Dr. Reynolds his opinion in these
 Controversies, as Mr. Barlee himself appears to be. But
 when by reading better Books than I had formerly done, and
 by conversing with better company, and by not-resisting the
 Grace of God, I lookt through the fallacies wherewith I
 had been blinded, and observed the ugliness of their looks
 whilst now I beheld them without their Visard, I was gladder
 to be recovered from those diseases of my Soul, than from
 the painfulest maladies which have ever happened to my
 body. And if my Reverend Antagonist is not afraid of a
 recovery, as that which implies him to have been sick, He
 may change his judgement, as I have done, though not be-
 cause I have done it. At least *King James*, and *Bishop An-*
drews, and good *Melancthon*, and the late *Primate of Ar-*
magh, * and learned Dr. Potter, are sure most worthy his
 imitation. And therefore

* Compare the
 16. Article of
 our Church
 with the first
 part of the
Homily touch-
 in *Falling a-*
 way from God.
 p. 54. & 57.
 with the Form
 of Baptism,
 with the Cate-
 chism, and all
 with the Con-
 ferencee at
Hampton Court
 p. 29, 30, 31.

* Of his
 change I have
 witness beyond
 exception.

§. 2. In the second place, I offer him this short Dilem-
 ma. Is a mans later opinion to be preferred before his for-
 mer, or is it not? If he say, Yes, His own example of *King*
James

James doth fly back into his Face. But if he say, *No*, His only Father *S. Austin* must be neglectfully cast behind his Back. And by necessary consequence, his worthy Friend Mr. *Barlee* (in the plausiblest part of all his *Plea*) must be contemptibly trampled beneath his Feet. Let him escape which way he pleaseth; there is a *Præcipice* before him, and behind him there is a *Wolf*. But yet the greatest of his Dangers is still to come. For

§. 3. In the third place I offer him another *Dilemma* with sharper Horns; (since Logicians will needs call it *Argumentum Corantum*.) Is *K. James* his judgement of any Authority, or is it not? If he saith, it is not, why is it urged so largely against *Arminius*, and *Bertius*, and their followers, in the very Front of his *Epistle*, which is intended for a strengthning to Mr. *Barlees* Book? And if he saith *Yes*, (as of necessity he must) his inconvenience is worse than if he sayd, *No*, for then farewell to the *Presbytery*, both Head and Tail, (it is the King's own * word) which was never so much hated by any one of the *Hierarchy*, as by the *Orthodox King James* (the very Epithet that is given him by the very *Correptory Correptor*.) (a) Witnesse his Excellent *Basilicon Dozon*, and his remarkable *Predictions* what the world was to look for from the *Presbyterian* sect, of which he gave so many black and dismal characters; witnesse all his *resentments* of their incomparable behaviours in the sixth and seventh Books of the *History of Scotland*, most impartially composed by *Arch-Bishop Spotswood*, with so much Wisdom, Temper, and Moderation, as may well commend it to all mens Readings; witnesse his Answer to Dr. *Reynolds* at *Hampton-Court*, where that Doctor had seemed to plead for something like a *Presbytery*. [*A Scottish * Presbytery*, " said the King, as well agreeth with *Monarchy*, as God " and the *Deuill*. Then *Jack*, and *Tom*, and *Will*, and *Dick*, " shall meet, and at their pleasures censure me, and my Coun- " cel, and all my proceedings. Then *Will* shall stand up and say, " it must be thus; then *Dick* shall reply, and say, nay marry, " but we will have it thus. And therefore here I must once " reiterate

* *Spotsw. Hist.*
Scot. l. 7.

† *Basil. Δωρ.*
l. 2 p. 38. & seq.
to p. 44.

* *Conference*
at Hampton
Court, p. 81.
Edit. 1638.

Sec. 3. and other Presbyterians.

9

“reiterate my former speeches, Le Roy s'avisera: stay I pray,
 “you for one seven years before you demand that of me, and if
 “you then find me pursej and fat, and my windpipes stuffed
 “I will perhaps hearken to you: for let thae government be once
 “up, I am sure I shall be kept in breath, then shall we all of us
 “have work enough, both our hands full. But, Dr. Reynolds,
 “till you find that I grow lazie, let that alone.] And this
 puts me in mind of a remarkable passage in his **Basilicon** *Bas. Δ^{up}.
l. 2. p. 39.
 “**Dorset**, where speaking of the *fiery spirited men in the mi-
 “nistery of the Kirk, who getting a guiding of the people
 at the time of confusion, and finding the gust of Govern-
 ment sweet, began to fancy to themselves a Democratick form
 “and having (by the iniquity of the time) being over well
 “baited upon the wrack, first of his Grandmother, and then
 “of his own Mother, and after usurping the liberty of the time
 “in his long minority settled themselves so fast upon that ima-
 “gined Democracy, as they fed themselves with the hope to be-
 “come Tribuni Plebis, and so in a popular Government by lead-
 “ing the people by the nose, to bear the sway of all the Rule;
 speaking I say of these Men, whom he calleth (a little after)
 the * unruly spirits among the ministry, he adviseth his son to
 take * heed of such, concluding in these words, — — I pro-
 “test before the great God (and since I am here as upon my
 “Testament, it is no place for me to lye in,) that ye shall never
 “find with any Highland or border Thieves, greater ingrati-
 “tude, and more lies and vile perjuries, than with these phana-
 “tick spirits. And suffer not the principles of them to brooke
 “your land, if ye like to sit at rest: except ye would keep them
 “for trying your patience, as Socrates did an evil Wife.] The
 Reader cannot but observe that these expressions are very
 sharp, and I hope he cannot but consider that they were
 spoken by King James, and were publickly legible from the
 Press before they came to my knowledge, and that I have
 quoted them no otherwise than in my Necessary Defense.
 My Reverend Aggressor hath drawn me to it by his Assault,
 and by the quality of his weapon hath forc'd me to use this
 very Helmet. I am no Bertian, or Arminian, yet he pro-
 claimed me to be such (if he will own having been pertinent
 in

* Ibid. p. 40:

* p. 41.

* p. 42.

in the second Paragraph of his Epistle) by urging King James his sharpnesse against those Persons, on that occasion. And if it was charitable or pertinent to set upon me in such a manner, and in the beginning of such a Book, with King James his declaration against Vorstius, Arminius, Bertius, and their Followers (including me to be one) how much more hath it been both, to defend my self, as I have done, by the same Kings writings? From all which together,

§. 4. It cannot but follow in the fourth place, That if King James his judgement and authority is of any weight or moment against Arminius and Bertius (whom yet I am not concern'd to plead for any farther than my Assaylant hath made me mistaken for an Arminian) it is of much more weight against the Sect of Presbyterians, of which Arminius himself was One. The Danger and Distemper which this controversy caused to the Belgick Nation, (if it must be said to have risen from the controversy in hand) arose from that very Party, and from those very Doctrines which I oppose; as I could easily Remonstrate, were this a place for so much Length; and which I shall do, if need require. And therefore I seriously advise my Reverend Adversary, that in his next undertaking against me, and my writings, he will be pleas'd to think twice, before he utters his Conceptions; that he will look round about him, and grasp the whole matter of which he treats; that he will not give me so many Advantages, as to occasion my being tedious. For that opponent doth please me most, in whom I find least matter of Contutation.

CHAP. III.

E. R.

"When you first acquainted me with your purpose to
 "answer that Tract, (which was before I had seen
 "it, it being then manuscript, and had only heard
 "from you the Drift of it,) you well remember
 "what my Judgement was, That in Polemical wri-
 "tings, it was the best to forbear the persons of
 "men, and to hold close to the Argument. I learn-
 "ed it of Tertullian, a grave Writer, *Viderit*
 "persona, cum doctrina mihi quæstio est. Tertul. adver-
sus Hermog. cap. 1.
 "it was the speech of an aged holy Divine of this
 "Country, now with God, that in Disputes, Soft
 "words and hard Arguments were best. Yet I
 "deny not but the Case may be so, that in writings
 "of this Nature, there may be a Necessity as well
 "of sharp Rebukes, as of strong refutations.
 "Tit. 1. 13.

T. P.

§. 17. **T**HE first thing to be noted in this his third Pa-
 ragraph, is, that in writings of this Nature,
 that is, of one Inferiour Presbyter against a-
 nother (who may be allow'd to be his Equal)
 in the debate of this Question, whether God's decrees are
 any of them conditionate or no, he allows a Necessity of sharp
 Rebukes; and (which is more to be admir'd) he pretends
 a reason for it from Tit. 1. 13. A passage written by St. Paul,
 first to Titus a Bishop at least, and by this Commission super-
 indow'd

indow'd by the Divine Authority of that Apostle, and so not pertinent to an Inferior Presbyter whose small Diocese of Brockhole makes him yet lesse fit to be my Diocesan. Secondly; To Titus, presiding over those under his charge at Creet, who were in Subordination, and not Coordinate, as here we are, and therefore here is no ground for an ἀλλοτριωσις. Thirdly, That commision given to Titus was ἐλέγχειν ἀπορίμους, not only precise, dure & sine ambagibus, (as * Beza speaks) but by way of Excision, or Excommunication, (as better * Interpreters explain it) and so not pertinent to that strange rayling and calumniating, calling Pelagian, Socinian, Heretick, Devil, Dragon, and a world of such stuff which in the Correytory Correytor is here commended, at least excused. Fourthly, The Persons thus to be used by the Discipline of Titus were those insufferable Hereticks, the Jewissh Gnosticks, who abused the Grace of God by Wantonneffe, denying Christ to be come in the Flesh, * subverting the Truth, that is to say, the whole Gospel, * defiled and unbeleev'ing, * denying God in their works, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate. Upon which I ask, Did this writer consider the rational scope and importance of that Text which he cited, or did he not? If he did not, what commendation can be pretended to, for having so hastily taken so sharp a sword into his hands without considering how to use it, and for the want of which consideration, he hath now received from it so great a Wound? But if he did consider it, and compare it with the Context (as I have just now done,) how much less is he commendable for having knowingly and wilfully so misapplied it? and how strange a specimen hath he given his Reader of all his future undertakings, when he holds forth Scripture to such an Author as Mr. Barlee, whereby to justify his Rayling, and to make him beleeve that there is a necessity of his so doing? Nor is it ordinary Rayling which is thus pleaded for, but so extraordinary in all kinds, that Mr. Barlee himself in his first Dedicatory Epistle, doth offer even in Print to undergo a (a) publick Penance, thereby confessing it a hainous Sin. He cries, Peccavi,

* Beza in locum.

* See Dr. Ham. Annota. upon 2 Cor. 13. ch. and in his Treatise concerning the power of the Keyes.

* ἀπορριπτοντες τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Verse 14:

* μαμνισμένοι, ἀπειροί. Ver. 15.

* ὁσὸν ἐργασίαν ἔχοντες, βδελυκτοί, ἀποδοῖς, ἀδυναμοί. Ver. 16.

2 Correy. Cor. Epist. Ded. P. 9.

Peccavi, and to (b) peccavi, adds (c) Fateor, (here is an open confession, and in a white sheet, tantamount to the stool of Repentance,) after this he (d) asks Forgiveness, and promisseth (e) hereafter to mend his manners. Yet immediately he makes another Dedicatory Epistle, and that on purpose to break his promise; on purpose to call me Dragon, & Noon-day-Devil; nay, *Demon meridianum*, is such a Devil, as till that time was never heard of, both Masculine and Neuter, yet neither He, nor She. And if my offspring is such a monstrous Devil, what doth he make me to be, who avow my self the Father of those very harmlesse and well-meant Papers, whose whole business it is to clear the God of all Purity from having any thing to do with the stool of wickednesse? Now upon whose Incitation and Authority I was so vehemently railed at for my perfect zeal to God's honour and the greatest interest of Souls, let Enemies and Friends and Strangers judge. For

b. c. Ibid.
d. c. Peto veniam, si unquam posthac. Id. ibid

§. 2. Secondly, In the twelfth pa. of Mr. Barlee's Declaration, he pleads a necessity of not being Toothlesse at his Tongues end, and that it was within his Commission to be cutting, and he fetcheth his Commission from Tit. 1. 13. Which how perfectly agreeable with the present passage under debate, I need not shew in many Words. They both pretend to a necessity, and both from Tit. 1. 13. And if we compare the Necessity pretended, with their known opinion of God's Decrees, we may guess the meaning to be plainly this, That he who rayles against his Neighbour hath a necessity of rayling, he being limited and determined from all Eternity to every action of his life by a decree antecedent to the foreknowledge of his Will. And therefore Mr. Barlee doth say in plain (f) terms, [That God will have it at this time to be so,] for which he cites that of the Heathen Poet, [*Deus, Deus nobis hac omnia fecit.*] Such principles, and such practice have already frightened not a few, who are no (g) Beggars or mean Disciples (as Mr. B. hath confessed in the close of his Dedicatory Postscript) from ever being of his religion. This is the thing, for which he ought to be deeply * humbled,

f Correp. Cor. p. 22.

g Epist. Ded. p. 16, 17.

* Id. ib. p. 16.

and

* Tit. I. 13.

h Correp. Cor.
p. 64.

and to bewail (as he words it) in tears of blood, that after such crying sins, as railing, and forging, and bearing false witness against an inoffensive and patient Neighbour, he should pretend to a Commission from such a * Text. Dr. Reynolds is far enough from being another Paul, and Mr. Barlee much farther from being another Titus, (notwithstanding his (h) Proclamation that he was beloved of Dr. Twisse, as another Timothy,) and I am yet much farther from being one of those Gnosticks, concerning whom that Text is spoken. But this is not all. For

§. 3. Thirdly, The Reverend Author of this Preface doth contradict the Former with the Latter part of this Paragraph. He doth acknowledge, that in disputes, soft words and hard Arguments are best; for which, besides his own judgement, he cites Tertullian. (A Father as contrary to his opinions, as he is worthy to be cited where he condemns them.) And yet he denies not but that the case may be so, "that in writings of this nature there may be a necessity, &c. But let him now speak out, was the case so here, or was it not? If this was the Case, and this a Writing of such a Nature, then what truth can there be in his own, and Tertullian's, and the aged holy Divines judgement? And if this was not the Case, we have here an Advocate of Contradiction, as well as of unconditional Decrees, who pleadeth the necessity of that thing which he confesseth to be an evil. Whereby he patronizeth Mr. Barlees sin, and helps to make him (k) sorry for his Repentance.

k Correp. Cor.
Epist. Ded.
p. 14.

§. 4. Fourthly, He professeth that his judgement is for soft words, and hard Arguments; for omitting the Person, and keeping close to the Purpose. Very good. How Mr. B. hath practis'd, I have largely shewed from the Pref. His calling me Atheist, Dragon, Devil, and the like, was neither hard Argument, nor soft word. And though when he said that I "am (l) furnished with the Greatest Advantage of Wit, Art, Oratory and Applause, he gave me indeed a soft word, yet it was no hard Argument whereby to prove me a (m) Satanic

l Correp. Cor.
Epist. Fed.
p. 16, 17.
m Id. p. 102.

SECT. 4 *Soft words and hard Arguments.*

15

cal Blasphemer, nor was it spoken in favour to me.

§. 5. I am next to discover (my irreverend Adversary being dispatch'd) how my Reverend Antagonist hath observed his own Rule. I acknowledge he hath given me some very soft words by professing to *respect me* for *Polite parts of Wit* and *Learning* (for which I will labour to requite him by very heartily acknowledging his *Learning*, and *Gravity*, his happiness of *Fancy*, and *Elocution*, his very civil *Disposition*, and *comparative moderation*,) But of the hardness of his *Arguments* I shall hasten to make an *easy Trial*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IIII.

E. R.

" Truly it was matter of much trouble to me, to find
 " in that Treatise a distinction of modest Blaf-
 " phemers, and other who are for Ligonem, Ligo-
 " nem: and to find so eminent Servants of Christ, as
 " Calvin, Dr. Twisse and others to be ranged under
 " one of those members, as men that tell the world
 " (though such words are no where found in them, but
 " the quite contrary) that the evil of sin in man pro-
 " ceedeth from God only as the Author, and from man
 " only as the Instrumēt; yea, to be worse than the Ma-
 " nichees & Marcionites of old, as to this particular
 " Blasphemy. For though the names of the Authors
 " are not, as is said, in civility cited, yet the Referen-
 " ces in the margin of the book (which surely were not
 " set there to bear no signification) make me think of
 " Tacitus his observation, touching the effigies of
 " Brutus and Cassius in the funeral of Junia, Præ-
 " fulgebant Brutus & Cassius eo ipso quod ef-
 " figies eorum non vifebantur. It had been much
 " to be wished that imputations of such a strain had
 " been left by men professing Modesty and Ingenuity,
 " unto Bolsec and others of his complexion. But by
 " whomsoever used they are but as the Confectioners
 " beating of his spices, which doth not at all hinder,
 " but strengthen the fragrancy of them. I do not jura-
 " re in verba either of Calvin or any other man. But

Tacit. Anal. 13.
 verb. ult.

Sec. 1. *Blasphemies truly so called.*

17

“ I cannot but with grief be sensible of so high a
 “ charge as *Blasphemy*, to be laid upon persons so deep-
 “ ly acquainted with the mind of God in his word, as
 “ they were. The vindicating of them I leave to you,
 “ and shall only say, that their Lord and their Brethren
 “ before them have met with the same measure, Mar.
 “ 2. 7. Mat. 26. 65. Acts 6. 13.

T. P.

§. 1. **H**IS first hard Argument from King James his bit-
 terness against *Arminius*, I have already mollified
 and soften'd in my second Chapter. This is his second hard
 Argument, the many soft parts of which I shall discover and
 demonstrate by these degrees. First, That *Distinction*
 which I made was in my p. 23. where I did not instance or
 exemplifie in any man whatsoever, much less in *Calvin* and
Dr. Twisse, (as every Reader may see and witness;) but to
 renger me unacceptable to every lover of those two, he is fain
 to leap as far back as to my p. 9. & 10. where yet I did not
 name them neither; but only set down their own words,
 amounting in brief to this effect [That all things (and by
 “ consequence all sins) do happen not only by God's prescience,
 “ but by his positive decree. That men do sin by God's impulse;
 “ and execute as well as contrive all mischief, not by God's
 “ permission only, but by his Command too. That God makes
 “ Angels and Men Transgressors. That Adultery or Mur-
 “ der is the work of God; that God is its Author, (and which
 “ is worse a Compeller. That besides God's Administring
 “ the occasions of sinning, and his Prostitutions to sin, he doth
 “ so move and urge them, that they smite the sinners mind, and
 “ really affect his Imagination, &c. and (what I had almost
 “ forgot to say) that God's Decree is no lesse efficacious in the
 “ permission of evil, than in the production of good. And
 “ that God's Will doth passe, not onely into the permission of the
 “ sin, but into the sin it self which is permitted.] These were
 D the

the horrible affirmations, which I there inserted as a specimen of what is taught by some Men, both to Forewarn my Readers of all such noxious and killing Weeds, in what ground soever they found them growing, and to manifest a Duty incumbent on me, to vindicate God from those Aspersions. The Author's Names I very obligingly concealed, that no ordinary Reader might know who they were; but yet I quoted their works where they were legible and in print, that extraordinary Readers might find me Faithful in my Quotations, and that an Enemy might not say, that I had only obtruded mine own Inventions. But so far were my References from being like to the effigies of Cassius and Brutus, that Mr. Barlee himself knew not what I meant by them; no, nor the Author of this Epistle, when he perused that Declamation. For if he had, he would not have suffered such an enormity to have passed the Presse without controul.

* See Div.
Philanthrop.
Defended ch.
2. Sect. 32. p.
127, &c. And
ch. 4. Sect. 32.
p. 36, 37.

§. 2. Secondly, when I said that some were for *Ligonem*, *Ligonem*, (but did not name any Creature) I meant such bold and barefac'd Sinners, who have spoken even in print the very worst Blasphemies of God Almighty, that the malicious Wit of Hell hath ever been able to invent. "As
"for Example, That God made Man on purpose that he
"might Sin, and that he might have something to damn him
"for justly. That the necessity of Sinning is cast upon Men by
"Gods own ordination That God is the Author of all evil,
"as well of Sin as of Punishment; not only of those Actions in
"and with which Sin is, but of the very Pravity, Ataxy, A-
"nomy, Irrigularity, and sinfulness it self which is in them;
"yea, that God hath more hand in Mens Sinfulness than they
"themselves. That God doth Necessitate Men to Sin, Incite,
"Seduce, Impel, Compel, Pull, and Draw, and Command Men
"to Sin, injects Deceptions, and Tempts Men unto Sin.
"With a numberless company of like Expressions, a
"small Catalogue of which I have collected in no more
"than 8. or 9. pages in my Account of the Correptory Correction:
"If such of these are no Blasphemies, then am not I to be
"excused for having avowed them to be such. But if they
"are

* See Div.
Philan. defend.
ch. 3. Sect. 34.
p. 132. to p.
141.

SECT. 2, 3. *Blasphemies truly so called.*

19

are *Blasphemies in grain*, and published to the world by the *Authors of them*, and if the *Authors of these Blasphemies* are led into them by those *opinions* which my Reverend Adversary asserteth, and I resist, how will he make me a reparation for having publickly done me so great a wrong, as to blame me for my distinction? How can he answer to all good Men, to the Church of God, and to God himself, that it was "matter of trouble to him that I should make a distinction of "modest Blasphemers, and others who for *Ligionem*, *Ligionem*? Is it not a Blasphemy to speak against God? Is it not the very blackest and most insufferable Blasphemy to speak against the very purity and holiness of God? Is not his Purity himself? and therefore it is not worse to asperse his purity, than to deny his being? And have not those Men, whom Dr. Reynolds pleads for, aspersed the purity of God with all the Fowlest Affirmations that can be thought on? Let him, or any Man living, sit down, and study, with what variety of words and phrases, it is possible to express the Author of sin, and I will publickly demonstrate that all that variety of words and phrases hath been used even in print (by the Men of that way which he asserteth, and I resist,) in direct Affirmations of God himself. I am sufficiently prepared to shew a very large Catalogue, besides the several Catalogues already shewn. And though I was so courteous as not to name them at the first, yet I had reason to say, that there were some in the world for *Ligionem*, *Ligionem*. And

a Borrh. Pess.

1. Impr. A.D.

1551.

b Zuñg. de

Pron. 1. 6. a-

bettered by Dr.

Twisse Vin.

Gr. 1. 2. part.

1 p. 36.

c Piscat. in

Reph. ad Tausf.

p. 65.

d Sturmius de

Prædest. Thef.

16.

e Musculus 1.

c. de desperati-

§. 3. Thirdly, when I said that some were modest Blasphemers, that is, bashful and shamefac'd, but did not name any Creature) I meant. Such Writers, as have only made God to be the Author of sin, by way of necessary consequence, and unavoidably deduction; but have not said with (a) Borrhæus, that God is the Author of evil, whether of punishment or of sin; nor with (b) Zuñglinus, That *Multery* or *Murder* is the work of God; nor with (c) Piscator, That whatsoever sinners and flagitious men do, they do it by the force of God's own will; nor with (d) Sturmius, That God effecteth those things which are sins; nor with (e) Musculus, that Gods Reprobation is one.

f Trigland.
Defens. fol.
180.

g Beza Cont.
Castel. p. 417.

h Peter Mart.
Verm. Flor. in

i Sam. 2.

k Adrian.
Smout. in
Heautontim. et
in Concordia
sua, p. 107.

the cause of the incurable Despair; nor with (f) Triglandius, That both the Elect and Reprobates were preordained to sin quatenus sin, nor with (g) Beza, That God predestin'd whom he pleased, not only to damnation, but to the causes of damnation; nor yet with Peter, (h) Vermilius, That God seemeth to be the cause, not only of humane actions, but of their very defects and privations; nor yet with (k) Smoutius, that Man ought to have sinned, and to have fallen from grace, that God might have matter whereon to manifest his justice. Now if I was so civil, as not to name either the modest, or the immodest Blasphemers, I should rather have been thank'd by their Disciples and Followers, than have been reviled for my civility. But

§. 4. Fourthly, Let us descend in particular to those Things and Persons, of which my Reverend Antagonist hath undertaken a defense, I mean the Citations in my Notes p. 9. and 10. I will begin with that of Zuinglius, because neither Mr. B. nor his Friends have yet discovered it to be his, at least they have not owned it under its Authors own Name.

l Huldéricus
Zuing. in Ser.
de Prov. c. 5.
§. 6.

* Note, that
when sin is
said to be good
as being the
work of God,
G^{od} himself
confesseth it
is the excuse
of the Liber-
tines, and un-
excusable.

Calv. Instruc.
adversus Li-
bertim.

The Scope of
that Blasphemy

["When (l) God makes an Angel or a Man a Transgressor, he himself doth not transgress, because he doth not break a Law. The very same sin, viz. Adultery, or Murder, in as much as it is the work of God, the Author, Mover, and Compellor, it is * not a Crime; but in as much as it is of Man, it is a wickednesse."] Is not the scope of those words underiably this, That although God is not a sinner, yet he maketh both Angels and Men to be so? That Adultery or Murder is the work of God, although it is not evil in as much as it is his? that God is the Author of sin, viz. Adultery or Murder, though sin is not sin in as much as He is the Author of it? nay, that God is a Compeller of Men to sin, though it is only sin as Men commit it, and not as God compels them to it? If this cannot be denied, why then said the Prefacer, that such words are no where to be found in them, but rather the contrary? That they are there to be found is apparent to all eyes which shall examine the place by my quotation, and is abundantly (m) confessed

SECT. 4. *Blasphemies truly so called.*

21

(m) confessed by Dr. Twisse. Whom I observe in (m) that place, not only approving, but commending Zuinglius for those expressions, which being every whit as bad as if he had spoken the words himself, is all that here needeth to be said of him: besides that the sixth, seventh, ninth, and tenth instance in my Notes, may here be noted to have been his. My first Citation from Mr. Calvin, [That all things happen by God's Decree, &c.] Without any the least exception of all ungodly and sinful things, nay, purposely including as well the evil as the good, (as I shall prove by and by) will soon appear to be a Blasphemy, to wit, a constituting God the Author of sin, by the publick confession of Mr. Calvin himself. For in a fit of Anger against the Libertines, and in other fit of Forgetfulness (which Anger easily produceth) what himself had said at other times, he chanced to let fall these expressions, [Whilst the (n) drunken Libertines "do jabber that all things are made [or done] by God, they constitute him the Author of Sin. Yet (o) Beza saith plainly, "more plainly than the Libertines,] That God efficaciously "acteth or effecteth all things without any the least exception whatsoever. And that Calvin means the same thing, when he saith [that all things happen by God's Decree,] is not only very evident by his agreement with Beza in these affairs, but by his own positions in other parts of his works: as when he saith, for example [that God did (p) therefore Foresee things, (p) because he decreed them,] and again, [that no other (q) cause can be rendered for the (q) defection of Angels, then that God did (q) reject them.] Which is to say in effect, That God, by his rejection or reprobation, was the only cause of the first and greatest sin that ever was, to wit, the defection or rebellion, or Apostacy of Angels; and again he saith, [that Man doth sin or do that which is not lawful for him to do (which we know is all one) impulsu Dei by God's impulse, or compulsion, or enforcement (let him translate impulsus, which way he pleaseth.) And this last as well as the first being one of my instances p. 9. I admire the Author of this Preface would seek to justify such horrid Things. What pretense of Reason he had for so doing, (Besides his partiality and

m Dr. Twisse
Vind. Gra. l. 2.
part. 1. Digres.
2. c. 1. Crim. 3.
Sect. 1. p. 37.

n Calvin In-
struēt. adversus
Libertinos.
o Beza contra
Castel. Aphor.
1. 6, 7.

p Calvin Instit.
l. 3. cap. 23.
Sect. 7. p. 325.
q Idem ibid.
Sect. 4.

and concernmen for one of the chiefest of his Party) we shall see hereafter in his Reply.

That that is
Blasphemy to
which I gave
that Name is
more than
proved by
that which
followes,

§. 5. Fifthly, whilst he blameth me for giving the Title of *modest* or *immodest* Blasphemy to such as make God to be the *Author of Sin*, sometimes in those very words, sometimes in such as are *equivalent*, and sometimes *worse*, he quite forgetteth how great a *Contumely* he hath heaped upon them, who have spoken more *broadly* than I have done, though not with a *purer* or *more disinterested* zeal to the honour of his *Attributes* for whom I pleaded. May he be pleased to consider these following Instances.

Irenæus told
Florinus for
merely seem-
ing to make
God the Author
of sin, (that is,
for saying
things which
did but sound
that way,) that
it was worse
than the Here-
ticks durst e-
ver speak.

Ταῦτα τὰ
δύγματα
φωεῖν ἐκ
ἐπὶ οὐκ
γνώμης, ταῦ-
τα τὰ δῖμα-
τα ἀσύμφο-
ρα ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλη-
σίας ἐκ τῶ
μυστήριου ἀπο-
βῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν
ἐκκλησιῶν αὐτοῖς. ταῦτα τὰ δῖγματα ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας αἰρητικοὶ ἐπὶ λυ-
σαν ἀποφανθέντες ἐπὶ ταῦτα τὰ δῖγματα οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπιστολῶν, οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἀπο-
στόλου σύμφωνοι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὡς ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῖς. Irenæus Edit. Colon. 1625 p. 510. Euseb.
Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 19.

1. When *Florinus* did but seem to make God the effecter or Cause of Sin, although he said it only by Consequence, and not in plain or downright terms, yet *Irenæus* (an Apostolical Father) thought it fit to confute him and chide him to death. And intituled his Epistle which he wrote to *Florinus*, [τὰς τῶ μὴ εἶναι τὴν θεοῦ μινητὴν καὶνῶν, concerning God's not being the cause of Sin.] It may satisfie some Readers to be told a few of the Fathers own words. [These Opinions, O *Florinus*, are not of wholesome Doctrine, they are disagreeable to the Church, they carry them that believe them into the greatest Impiety. These opinions the very Hereticks without the Church were never so daring as to affirm; the Elders before us, who conversed with the Apostles delivered no such things unto us. [To which he adds,] I am able to testify before God, that if *Polycarp* had heard any such things, he would have stopped his Ears, and have cried out as he was wont, O good God, unto what times hath thou reserved me, that I should endure such things! He would have fled from the place where- in he sat or stood, when he had heard such expressions. And this might be manifested (saith *Irenæus*) out of *Polycarp's* Epistles which were written to Neighbour-Churches, or to some of the Brethren; the words follow thus, as a new Testimony,

Sect. 5. Blasphemies truly so called.

21

2. Δύναται διαμαρτυρεῖσθαι ἐμπροσθεν τῶ θεοῦ, ὃν οἷον τοῦτον ἡ κλῆς ἐκείνος ὁ μαρτυρεῖται καὶ ἀποστολικὸς πρεσβύτερος ἀπακρεβάζας αὐτὸν καὶ ἐμπαράξας πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ κατὰ τὸ συνήθες αἰσθῶν ὃ καλεῖ θεὸν, οἷς οἷς μετὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἵνα τέτοιαι ἀνέχουμαι, πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸν πῶτον ἐν ὧ κατεζέμεθα ἢ ἐς ὧς, τῶν τοιούτων ἡ κλῆς λέγων, καὶ ἐν τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἢ αὐτῶν ἐπίσταται ἢ τοιούτοις γυναικῶσι, ἐπιστολῶν αὐτῶν, ἢ τῶν ἀλλῶν τισὶν μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ προτερόμενος δύναται φανερωθῆναι. St. Polycare, that blessed & Apostolical Martyr, if he had heard any expression which only seemed to have a Tendency to the making God the Author of sin, he would have started out of the place, and stopp'd his Ears, and Cryed out, O my God, &c. Euseb. Hist. l. 5. c. 20. Item. loco Citato.

3. When St. *Augustin* was accused, by some of his *Correptory Correctors*, of having *Denied universal Redemption*, and other things of that nature, which all my Adversaries do hold and teach, he was so angry and so impatient of such *slandorous Imputations*, that he could not with-hold his pen from *sharper language* than I have used, though more provoked than he could be. He did not only say, that [those one of the ungodly and profane opinions had not the very least footstep in his Heart,] nor did he content himself to call them [Blasphemies,] but [prodigious Lyes of most foolish Blasphemies,] and no less than *Diabolical*. Saint *Austin* reckon'd the Denial of universal Redemption for one of the foolishest Blasphemies, &c. one of the ungodly and profane opinions, though not so foolish, or so ungodly, as to impute unto God any

Causality of sin. His words are, *Ineptissimarum Blasphemiarum prodigiosa mendacia. Impiarum profanarumq; opinionum nullum cordibus nostris vestigium inhaesisse agnoscent, & Blasphemias, quas perspexerint nostrâ professione damnari, in earundem repertoriis censeant debere puniri.* *Augustin.* in *Præfat. ad Articulos quosdam sibi impositos*, p. 855, 856. Sed in operibus *Prosp.* p. 934, 935.

4. When the same *Austin* was accused by some *Pelagians* of making God an *Acceptor of Persons* by asserting *irrespective and unconditional degrees of Reprobation and Election*; he did not give them the *lie* only, but told them besides, [they were (r) bewitched by the Devil to its invention,] what then are *They* who either directly or indirectly do make God himself to be the *Author of sin*? Cum videamus, vos sic à Diabolo esse fasciatus. *August.* l. 6. Hypognoftic. in præfat. p. 879, 880.

5. When the *French Massilians* objected it as the opinion of St. *Austin*, that God denieth perseverance to some of his Sons who are regenerate in Christ, because they were not elected

ont

Prosper calls it out of the Masse of perdition: Prosper makes answer in these an immoderate expressions. [“ That of those that are regenerate in Jesus wickednesse, “ Christ, some forsaking their Faith and pious maners do and a calum- “ apostatize, and fall from God, and end their wicked niating of God, “ life in that aversion, is proved too plainly by many exam- to impute a- “ ples. But to ascribe their fall to God is an immoderate wicked- ine to God’s “ nesse, as if God were the Impulsor and Author of their ru- not electing “ ine, because he foresaw that they would wilfully fall away, him to the fi- “ and for that very reason did not sever them from the sons nal means of “ of perdition; and therefore men ought not to calumniate Salvation, “ God.] How many wayes this makes for me and my cause a- though no- “ gaing my reverend Assailant, let who will judge. thing neer- “ such a wicked- nesse or such a calumniating of God, as the many black speeches which I have cited and condemned.

— Sed horum Lapsus Deo ascribere, immodica Pravitatis est, quasi ideo Ruina ipsorum Impulsor atque Author sit, quia illos ruituros propria ipsorum voluntate praevidit, & ob hoc, à filiis Perditionis nullà praedestinatione discrevit. Prosp. Aquit. ad ob. Gall. capit. 7. p. 320, 321.

The Arausican 6. The second Arausican Council which was held in the Council pronounced a time of Leo the first against the Semipelagians (let that be marked) as it hath much for my cause (who have been publickly calumniated for more than Semipelagianism) so it hath this sharp passage against the very Man that hath opposed me. [“ This we believe according to the Catholick Faith, believe that “ that all who are baptized, and have by Baptism received God did pre- “ grace, are both able, and bound in duty, (by Christ his destine any “ help and cooperation) to fulfil those things which do be- Man to evil. “ long unto Salvation, if they will faithfully labour in order Secundum fidem Catholi- “ to it. But that any were Predestinated to Evil by the di- cam credimus, quod accepta per baptismum gratia omnes baptizati, “ vine power we do not only not believe, but withal, if there “ are any who will believe so great an evil, we do with all “ detestation pronounce an Anathema against them.] If the indifferent Reader will compare this definition of that Coun- Christ auxiliante & cooperante, quae ad salutem pertinent, possint & delectant, si fideliter laborare voluerint, adimplere. Aliquos vero ad malum divina potestate praedestinos esse, non solum non credimus, sed & seque.

Sect. 5. Blasphemies truly so called.

25

cel with either my (a) greater or (b) lesser Catalogue of those a The Divine
horrible doctrines which I condemned, and for the condem- Philan. Defen.
ning of which I have been publicly condemned by that re- ch. 3. Sect. 34.
verend Person with whom I now deal, he will not fail to p. 132, &c.
think it much more than strange. For as all the great and b Correct Copy,
holy Men of that so venerable a Council, who were deeply ac- &c. p. 9, 10.
quainted with the mind of God in his word, have detested those
Doctrines as well as I, so that unseasonable reproof (to say no Sed etiam si
worse) which was given to me by my Antagonist, doth qui sunt qui
reach as far as those Fathers of which that Council was com- tantum malum
posed. credere velint,
cum omni dete-
statione illis

Anathema dicimus. Concil. 2. Arausic. Cap. 1. 25. mihi p. 902:

7. In Nicetas his Saracenic there is this solemn form of Nicetas shews
renouncing Mahomed and his Religion. [I do Anathematize it a Blasphemy
“ the Blasphemy of Mahomed, saying, that God deceiveth to be anathema-
“ whom he will, and whom he will he leadeth to what is good; for tiz’d as the
“ if God would, Men would not war one with another, but he very worst
“ doth what he will, and is himself the cause of all good and thing in the
“ of all evil; all things are governed by Fate and Destiny; wicked Religi-
which infers a necessity of all events.] If the Authors on of the
whom I cited both in my greater and lesser Catalogue have Turks, to say
said the very same things with the Idolaters of Mahomed, and in equivalence
every whit as much worse as worse may be, (and whether and effect
they have not so done, I appeal to all who shall compare (though not
them) it will not be much for my Adversaries credit, that in those very
the loss of my thanks should be the best reward of my De- terms) that God
votion. is the Author of
Sin:

Αναθματίζω
τὸν καὶ Μαμεδ
βλασφημῶν, καὶ
τὸν λέγοντα, ὅτι θεὸς, ὃς θέλει, πλανᾷ, καὶ ὃς θέλει ὁδηγᾷ εἰς ἀγαθόν, καὶ ὅτι οἱ ἰ θεὸς ἢ
θελεῖν ἢ αἰ ἐπιθυμῶν ἀλλήλοισι οἱ ἀνθρώποι ἀλλ, αὐτὸς ποιεῖ ὅτι βέλτεται, καὶ παντὸς ἀγαθῦ
καὶ πονηρῦ αἴτιον αὐτός ἐστι, καὶ πᾶς καὶ ἐμμετριῶν πᾶτων κρατεῖ. Vide B.B. Patr. Græc.
Vol. 2. p. 286.

Melancthon calls it a stoical opinion, & such as supposeth a stoical God; pernicious to practice; and such as was abhorred by Heathen Plato; to aver a necessity of all events. Nequaquam stoica opinioniones in Ecclesiam invadende: quomodo enim invocabit Deum is qui omnia neces-

8. Melancthon saith, [that no Stoical opinions are to be brought into the Church; for how can he call upon God, who holds that all things do come to pass of necessity? Plato [though a Heathen] doth speak more honourably of God, and would have every one banished from the Society of men who should say in a Poem or any other narrative, that God is the cause of any Mans evil. In the opinion of Melancthon, they make a Stoical God, who feign him giving a necessity to all events.] And is not that to blaspheme him, without saying in terminis, he is the Author of Sin? Whilst Melancthon sayth plainly, that the Devill is the Author of Sin, what doth he make them to be who say the same of God Almighty? Whether they do so or not, I again refer it to be judged by what I have shewed in my greater and lesser Catalogue, as well as by what I shall shew anon.

sario evenire statuit? deinde moribus perniciosum est, &c. Plato honestius loquitur, cum, &c. adeo Deus Creaturis, non ut stoicus Deus, &c. Melancthon in loc. com. de Causa pec. p. 54, 55. Apparuit Filius Dei, ut victima fieret pro peccato, & ostenderet, Diabolum esse Authorem Peccati. Id. ibid. p. 48.

Bp. Tunstall saith they are more blasphemous than the Devils, who say that God doth predestinate men to sin. Domini nostri majestatem blasphemant, creatori suo petulantia sua lasciviam imputare non formidant, nihil verecundantes in Deum opificem sua scelera retorquere, quia ab illo se predestinatos ut sint flagitiosos, pro Apologia respondent. Lib. contra Blasph. predest. Dei in præf. p. 3.

9. Bishop Cutbert Tunstall of Durham, who lived in the dayes of King Henry the eighth, and was one of those chief Men who did cast the Papacy out of this Kingdom, (no Bollsoc therefore) a very moderate Writer, a great opposer of Pelagianism, and very inclinable to the way of Saint Austin, (as it doth appear by his discourse from p. 35. to p. 40. &c.) this learned Writer is very severe against the Men of his time, who did blaspheme the Majesty of the Lord by "imputing the lust of their Petulance to their Creator, laying their sins to his charge, and alleging this for their Apology, that they were predestin'd to be wicked by him that made them. These he calls (*) monsters far worse than the Devils, because the Devils do not dare to blaspheme God in

* Monstra hominum longè pejora Dæmoniis quæ Deum blasphemare non audent, ibidem p. 4.

"this

Se&t. 5. Blasphemies truly so called.

28

“ *this manner.* And thereupon concludes with a Prayer to Christ “ *thae he would (*) purge his Church from these Blasphemies by sealing up the lips of such as vent them . Every wicked one (saith the Bishop in his following pages) doth not fear to affirm, that God himself is the Author of his sins, (and thus blasphemeth within himself) I ’was created by God, to what end God knows. If he predestin’d me to Destruction, by an immutable Decree, why do I kick against the prick, and defraud my self of my voluptuousnesse ? But if I was predestin’d to life Eternal, how much soever I sin, I shall be saved in the conclusion, for his Fore-knowledge concerning me cannot be frustrated or deceived.* ”

* *Ut ab his blasphemiis suam Ecclesiam purgans, mutaret hujusmodi labia dolosa. sub finem. Sceleratus quisque ipsum Deum scelerum suorum autorem esse impie blasphemare non formidat: ego à Deo creatus*

sum, in quem finem ipse opifex novit. Si ad interitum me prædestinavit, cum certa sit ejus sententia, & qua ille futura decrevit mutari nequeunt, cur ego in vanum contra stimulum calcitrem, & me defraudem Genio ? Si autem prædestinatus sum ab eo ad vitam eternam, quam tuncumque hic deliquero, — in fine tandem salvus ero; neque enim ejus de me præsciencia falli quovis modo potest. Id. ib. cap. 1. p. 5, & 6.

10. That worthy Disciple of Melancthon, *Nicolaus Hemmingius*, (whom for his Learning, Piety, and Moderation, perhaps I may call *Melancthon Junior.*) doth seldom or never make mention of such as propagate the Doctrine of unconditional Decrees, and the absolute necessity of all events, without a token of his abhorrence and Indignation. He calls them stoical (a) imaginations, to which he opposeth the Word of God; again, the stoical (b) opinion of predestination, whereby the glory of God is injur’d, evil manners confirmed, and Epicurism introduced. It Feigns an Inequality and partiality in God; and makes Men careless to lay hold on that Grace which is offered unto all ? (c) Again, This perverse opinion is not only blasphemous against God, but also seduceth many Men either into despair of forgiveness, or into carnal security. Again, (d) by stoical Dreams, and fatal Books, and the Tables of the Destinies, which they imagin and fancy to themselves, they do miserably intangle themselves, and perniciously pervert others. Again a little after, he obliquely compares them to the

Hemmingius his marks of Detestation of the absolute way, which he could hardly think of without a holy kind of Impatience. a De pastore. pag. 150. b De prædest. cap. 1. class. 3. pag. 408, 409, 410. c De viâ vitæ. cap. 5. Benef. 2. pag. 550. d In Syntag. Institut. Christi leco 28. de Prædest. p. 770

e Id. Ibid. p.
771. Theo-
rem. 10.

f Id. Ibid. p.
776. Theor.
52.

g Cum Theo-
logis qualiter
sentiant, agit

D. Hemmingius

ut modestum & pium Christi Servum de ret. S. G. S. in observat Hemming. praefixio.

(e) Family of Zeno, and concludes with an Exhortation, not to value or esteem those (f) stoical Decrees, though some great Men do patronize them. These are the expressions of that Grave writer, who was publick professor of Divinity to the King of Denmark; and is (g) acknowledged by a Dissenter to have spoken of Dissenters, as became a Servant of Jesus Christ.

Felix Turpio
his sharp cen-
sure of such as
hold a necessity
of all events.

Mahometanis
ac plane perditis
hominibus

relinquenda est
ea, quam Dia-
belus ad Chri-

tiani populi
perniciem in-

duxit, futura-
rum rerum

Necessitas, ex
cujus opinione, quin maxima pars scelerum, quae in Ecclesia Christo initiatis regnare corni-

mus, tanquam ex perenni quodam fonte deriventur, non dubito. Fel. Turp. in Praef. ad Castell. p. 10.

11. The *Ingenuous* Author of the preface before *Castellio* (as Mr. B. himself did very happily call him) affirms [the necessity of all things future to be an opinion invented by the Devil for the destruction of Christian people, and to be left wholly to the Mahometans and men desperately wicked, as being the Fountain of most enormities in Christendom,] which I observe the rather because our *Correptorie* *Correptor* gave him in the *Epithete* of *Ingenuous*, and because he speaks more sharply than I did, although his motive is not so great; for the Men whom I accused had said much worse, and in words more filthy, than that there is a necessity of all things Future.

Grotius, the
Great, calls
them the Ene-

mies of God,
who make God

the Author and
cherisher of sin.

though not in
those very

words, yet in
such as are e-

qual to them.

12. *Immortal Grotius* in his *Investigatio* of *Antichrist* doth devoutly breath forth into this exposition. [To whom can the Name of *Antichrist*, or him that opposeth himself against God, be more agreeable, than to them who make the good God to be the Author and Fautor of all Impieties?] Thereupon he reckons up some of their prodigious speeches who are wont to hide themselves with their pretended enmity to *Arminius*, of which I intend to give account in my following Section. I will only here observe, that he alludes to those very Men who were a part of my Catalogue; and

Cui magis competit nomen Antichristi [Deo adversantis] quam iis qui summe bonum faciunt omnium Scelerum Auctorem & Fautorem? &c. Grot. in Appendice de Antichristo. p. 64, 65. vide etiam p. 85.

shewes

shewes how *contrary* they are to the Protestant Confession at *Augusta*, (and therein to *Melancthon*) which teacheth *Free-will* in the *Orthodox Notion* (Art 18.) and that the *will* of the wicked is the *cause* of their *wickednesse*, (Art 19.) and that they who are *not righteous* who commit *mortal sins*, because God requires that we *resist* our vile *affections*. (Art. 20.) and which condemns them that say, *That men being once justified can never lose the Holy Ghost*. 1b. editionis *Grotiana* 34.

13. It is no less than *Ranck Blasphemy* to make God the
 "Author of sin. Psal. 5. 4. Our sin is our own, and the wages ^{Bishop Hall,}
 "of sin is Death. He that doth the work earns the wages; ^{that pious and}
 "so then, the righteous God is cleared both of the sin, and our late, and who ^{learned Pre-}
 "death, only his Justice payes what we will needs deserve, ^{was one of the}
 "we ought to give the Devil his due, it is possible for us to ^{Synod of Dort.}
 "wrong that Malignant Spirit, in casting upon him those e- ^{callest even}
 "vils which are not properly His. There are carnal Temp- ^{them blasphe-}
 "tations that are raised out of our own corrupt Nature, which ^{maus Cavillers,}
 "needs not Satans immediate hand; being once depraved we ^{condemnation}
 "can act evil of our selves, and if Satan be the Father of sin ^{(which is not}
 "our will is the Mother, and sin is the cursed Issue of both--- ^{sin, but its ef-}
 "The Devil could not take, unless we gave; our will betrays us the ^{fect only) upon}
 "to his Tyranny, (and before p. 102.) how unjustly hath ^{the absolute}
 "the presumption of *Blasphemous Cavillers* been wont to ^{will of an unrea-}
 "cast the envy of their Condemnation meerly upon the absolute ^{spective power.}
 "will of an unrespective power, as if the Damnation of the ^{Select}
 "Creature were only a supreme will, not of a just merit, &c. 35. from p. 1 ^{Thoughts,}
 How very heavily this falls, in several respects, upon all my ^{Medit. 34. &}
 Accusers, any Reader who is awake cannot chuse but see ^{102. to p. 107:}
 without a Candle or a Comment.

These few examples (few I mean in comparison of what I am able to produce) are enough to make it appear, how very mildly I spake in the *Correct Copy* of my Notes, and through how great an *advertency* I have been blamed. I hope he will not now say, that *Imputations* of such a strain as are found in the writings of *antient Fathers*, and *Councils*, and *modern Divines* of the Protestant Church, might have been left by Men professing *Modesty*, unto *Bolsec* and

and others of their complexion. But what will he say, if I said no more against the Teachers of such Doctrine, than themselves, by fits, have many times said against themselves? I will shew in one paragraph the great severity of their Censures, and in another I will manifest how very partly those Censures do hit themselves.

Mr: Calvin's own censure exceedeth mine, if not that of Bellarmine and Bolsec too.

a Notandum ex hoc Alitculo, tria admodum horrenda consequi, 1. nullum inter Deum & Diabolum discrimen fore, &c. Calvin contra libert. c. 23.

b Ipsum a se negari oportet, & in Diabolum transmutari. Id. ib. c. 14.

cc Ac ne peccata quidem excipi possunt. Beza advers. Castell. Aphor. 1. & 6. e Eiusdem Calvini iudicio, quæ perperam & injuste ab hominibus fiunt, eadem iusta &

recta sunt Dei opera. Id. ib. * To which add Instit. l. 3. c. 23 Sect. 6, 7, 8. & Sect. 4. ff Certè ut quidvis contra tam prodigiosam Blasphemiam dicatur, libenter patiar. Calvin de occult. Dei Prov. p. 736.

§. 6. Sixthly therefore, Is it not so that Mr. Calvin disputing against the Libertines is fain to say in plain terms, "[that (a) from this one Article God worketh all things, three things do follow extremely frightful; of which the first is, that there will be no difference between God and the Devil? &c. nay further, (in the (b) next Chapter) that God must be renounced by himself, and be transmuted into the (b) Devil?] And doth not Beza himself incur that censure, whilst he so interprets that Text [God worketh all things, Ep. 1. 11.] As to say to that that universal particle [all] could not be (c) restrained by any the least exception, & that (c) sins themselves cannot be excepted? And doth not Calvin say again the direct contrary to Beza, that S. Paul there speaks only of the graces of the Holy Ghost? and yet doth not Beza cite Calvin's own judgement for his exposition which is so contrary to Calvin's? as when he saith, that "in the judgement of Calvin, those things which are wickedly done by Men are the righteous (e) works of God? And again, doth not Calvin incur his own censure by what he saith in my greater and lesser * Catalogue? (and in many other places, which I can name if challenged to it?) or if he had not thus spoken against himself, yet is it sufficient for my plea against my Assailant, that he hath spoken such bitter things as have lighted so heavily upon his own Party. He saith expressly elsewhere, that it is a monstrous (f) prodigious Blasphemy to say that God is the Author of Sin, and consents that (f) anything be said against it. Now it having been evidenced (as it shall be also farther) that the chief

Se&t.6. *Blasphemiestruly so called*

31

men of his *Party* have affirmed that horrible proposition, both in *equivalent*, and *down-right Terms*, and in *Terms* of a more *fulsom* and *blacker strain*, (it being worse to *compel* men to *sin*, than to be *simpliciter* an *Author* of it,) I was permitted by his (g) *leave* to have spoken as *sharply* as any *Bolsec* of those expressions which I mentioned, and I had thanks due to me for having been no *sharper*.

2. *Doctor Whitaker* himself hath these words following. "[*If Calvin, or Martyr, or any of our Men affirm God to be the Author and cause of sin, I do not deny our being guilty, all of us, of detestable Blasphemy and wickednesse.*] Here the Reader may observe a very *remarkable Concession* in 3. respects: First if *any* of their *Party* shall so affirm, not only *Calvin* and *Martyr*. Secondly, if *any* shall so affirm, they are *all* of them *guilty* without exception; of which the reason must needs be this, because they do *all* without exception hold the very *same principles* of *irrespective Decrees* of *Reprobation*, &c. and the *absolute necessity* of *all events*, from whence *any* of them do draw such *detestable conclusions*. Thirdly, that they are *all* of them *guilty* of horrible *blasphemy* and *wickednes*, if there is any *Truth* in that *supposition*. From which *three things* I do in *charity* conclude, that if *Doctor Whitaker* had observed such affirmations of his party, as have been observed by * *Melancthon*, learned *Moulin*, my insignificant *self*, and many others without number, he would have been frightened out of their *Tenents* of *unconditional reprobation*, as *Melancthon* and *Moulin* are known to have been. For (b) *Zuinglius*, (k) *Martin Borrhans*, and others, have said *αυτολοιπον*, and in plain Terms, that *God* is the *Author* of the *evil* of *sin*, and that *sin* is the *work* of *God*, and particulariz'd in *Adultery*, and *Murther*. *Zanchy* hath said that Men were *pre-ordained* by *God* to (l) *sin* as *sin*. *Piscator* hath affirmed, that *Reprobates* are *predestin'd* to the very (m) *Causes* of *Damnation*; that is, to *sins*; and that (n) *Incredulity* (by name)

g This Mr. B. confesseth, Correpr. Corr, page 64.

Dr. Whitaker's severe Censure of his own party upon supposition that they say what I have proved, and shall prove they have said with a witness. Si Calvinus aut Martyr aut quisquam nostrum affirmet, Deum esse Causam peccati, non repugno, quin simus omnes horrendæ blasphemiz scelerisq; rei. Whitaker. lib. 8. contra Duræum. Se&t. 1: * Note, that Dr. Whitaker in the place cited, seemeth not to have heard, at that time of *Melancthon's change*. (b) Huld.

Zuing Serm. de Pro. c. 5. & 6. (k) *Marr. Borth.* in *Isa.* 28 (l) *Ad peccatum quâ peccatum.* *Zanch.* de *Nat. Dei* l. 5. *Theſt.* 4. de *Repr.* p. 555. (m) *Piscator contra Tauf.* p. 47. (n) *Idem* in *Resp. ad Dupl. Vorſt. part.* 1. p. 10, 11.

doth

o Trigland
Apolog. p.
172.
p Musculus 1.
c. de Despe-
ratione.
q Calvin. l. 3.
c. 23. Sect. 4.
r Illius impul-
su agit quod si-
bi non licet. Id.
Ib. l. i. c. 18.
Section 4.
s The Div.
Philan. c. 3.
Sect. 34 p 139.

doth depend upon God's Predestination, as the Cause upon the effect, Triglandius saith, God willeth and (o) effecteth that ungodly Men do live in their concupiscences. Musculus avoweth, that God's Reprobation is the hidden (p) Cause of final despair, (no peccadillo.) These are some of that party, and of the chief. Come now to those Men which he particularly nameth, viz. Calvin and Martyr, Calvin saith, That there is no other (q) cause of the Angels Defection (which was the first and greatest sin that ever was) but God's rejection or Reprobation. Nay farther, that Men do sin by God's (r) Impulse. And Peter Martyr speaks as broadly as ever Man did; which though I have (s) publicly shewed already: yet because he is the Man whom Doctor Whitaker thought fit to Name, I shall set down a passage which I have since observed in reading his Comment upon the Book of

t Vulgus exi-
stimat, cum
Deus excicare,
indurare, trade-
re, immittere,
decipere disci-
tur, nihil aliud
significari, quam
ipsum permit-
tere ut ista fi-
ant; in quam
sententiam per-
multi ex Patri-
bus eas locutio-
nes interpre-
tantur, ea procul
dubio ratione
adducti, quod
squeamiffnesse
of the Primitive
Fathers, because
they were
startled at such
Buggs, as God's
being the Author
or cause of
sin. So again in
his Comment upon
the Epistle to the
Auctor Pecca-

Samuel. [The (t) vulgar sort (saith he) are of opinion, "that when God is said to blind, to harden, to deliver up, to send delusions, and to deceive, nothing else is signified, "but that he permitteth that those things be done. And to "that same purpose very many of the Fathers (he should "have said all) do interpret those expressions. And doubt- "less they were induced so to do, because they thought it "impious and blasphemous that God should be accounted the "Author of sin; and because they were unwilling, that "Men should lay the causes of their sins upon God himself. (But he would have them all to know, that) God doth not only "permit, but also Will Sin.] Here we have a Taste of this valiant Florentine, who contemns the cowardize of the vulgar (such as Melancthon and Hemmingius) and the adducti, quod squeamiffnesse of the Primitive Fathers, because they were startled at such Buggs, as God's being the Author or cause of sin. So again in his Comment upon the Epistle to the Auctor Pecca-

ti haberetur: nolentes, homines peccatorum suorum causas in Deum ipsum rejicere ———
Deus non tantum permittit, sed & vult peccatum, Pet. Mart. Vermil. in 1 Sam. chap. 2.
p. 21.

SECT. 7. *Blasphemies truly so called.*

33

(u) *Romans*, he confesseth that *all the Fathers* (at least *Omnes ferè* "almost all") do teach, that to *deliver up to sin* doth signify *Pautes docent*, "no more, than to *suffer*, or *permit*, or *forsake*, because *Tradere per* "they have an *abhorrence* to the saying that *God is the cause* inde esse, ac si "of *sin*. But he *rejects* their opinion, and pretends to *refel-* dicereur, si- nere, permit- it by striving to dissipate their *Reasons*, (p. 79 80.) and so, tere, aut dese- he finally concludes *against them*, and to confirm what he rere videntur hath done (without the least fear of the Fathers *Scar-* ut dicant, De- *Crowes*) he makes *Austin* to be for him, whom he confesseth um esse Cau- to be against him; and whose words against him he first of sam peccati. all citeth, before those others which he will have to make — Sed non for him. From all which it followes, that I had the fa- videtur pro- vourable allowance of Mr. *Calvin* and Dr. *Whitaker*, to ac- pter istas ratio- cuse those writers of horrid *Blasphemy* and wickedness, who nes idonea per- are commended by my *Adversary* for their deep acquain- suasio adduci, tance with the mind of *God*. But I have not yet shewed him ut interprete- mur hæc verba the last degree of his *misfortune* in that *Assault* which he Tradere, ob- made upon my *Cause* and *Reputation*. For durare, ex- cecare, per- finire, per-

mittere, desere. Idem in Rom: 1. Edit. Basil. A. D. 1570. pag. 78, 79, 80

§. 7. *Seventhly*, I have the *suffrage* and *Vote* almost of *That they are* all, (and of such, whom I am sure he will not dare to *guilty of the* contradict,) that the men of that party which he defendeth, *Blasphemy* are guilty (of all, and) of more, than I have laid to their *who were by* charge, *me accused,* *is more than*

proved by that which follows.

1. His own beloved Dr. *Twisse* whom he so vehemently *Doctor* commendeth, is more wayes his *Enemy* than he is aware, for *Twisse his* first he avoweth, that from the sayings of *Aquinas* and of *Censure* and "the *Jesuits* [*That the act of sin is from God*] the *unlearned* *Confession-* " *Libertines* might very easily collect, that *God was the Author* *Negari non po-* "of all the *Lewdnesses* which are committed by *wicked men*. *test, Aquina-* And yet I think that no man is so ridiculous as to say, that *docuisse ipsum* *allum Peccati*, esse à Deo: idem docent hodie Jesuitæ, ex quibus quàm facile quæso fuit viris istis indoctis, quales erant Libertini, colligere, Deum auctorem fuisse omnium Scelerum, quæ ab hominibus perpetrantur? Addunt Dominicani, Deum determinare voluntatem Creaturæ ad omnem actum suum, etiam ad actum peccati, nunquam tam disertè sententiam suam expressisse hætenus reperti sunt Calviniani. Twiss. Vin. Gra. l. 2. part. 1. crim. 3. Sect. 1. p. 52.

F

Aquinas

w See Cor-
rect Copie.
p. 10.

x Vin. Gra. l.
1. par. 1. Sect.
4. c. 4. Dig.
4. p. 88.

Aquinas and the *Jesuits* have spoken so broadly, as the fol-
lowers of *Mr. Perkins* and *Mr. Calvin*; and though the
Doctor saith of the *Dominicans*, that they have expressed
“their opinion more distinctly than the *Calvinists*, by saying
“that God doth determin the will of the Creature to every one
“of their acts, the act of sin not excepted, yet we know by
sad experience, that the Doctor either was deceived, or had
an Intention to deceive; besides, that himself (w) else-
where hath blamed the *Dominicans* for mincing the matter,
and not speaking out so distinctly as he would have had
them. He also palpably implyeth, that the *Calvinists* opi-
nion is just the same with the *Dominicans*, though he suppo-
seth the *Dominicans* to have made it out in plainer terms. Se-
condly, *Dr. Twisse* accuseth the (x) *Sublapsarians*, (and
our Reverend Epistoler is one of them) of having fallen upon
the Rock which they hoped to have escaped by their escape of
the *Supralapsarian* way, viz. their making God to be the Au-
thor of sin. And I accused none of them of any more, than
they all accuse one another, and this shall be seen in an other
example.

The Divided Members of that party who call themselves *Antipelagians* and the Enemies of *Arminius*, are irreconcilable Enemies to each other, and may be called *Antitri-Allelians*, *Deo nihil infipientius nec stultius affingi potest.* &c. *Nihil injustius excogitari potest.* &c.

2. *Gomarus*, and *Festus*, and other *Supralapsarians*, do very bitterly contend against *Acronius* and *Dontelock* and other *Sublapsarians*, [That nothing more foolish or more sottish can be fictitiously fastned upon God; than that he should have created Man without having constituted his end either of salvation or damnation, or the making of his wrath and his Power known in the perdition of the Reprobates.] *Acronius* on the contrary, and the rest of his way, exclaim as much against the *Supralapsarians* [That no greater injustice can be imagined, than that Man should be reprobated or created to destruction, without the least intuition of his being polluted with any sin.] And whilest the Learned (y) *Grevinghovius* finds them playing

y Si utrique parti adversarii blasphemias atroces objicenti credam, utramque Blasphemiam ream teneo; si neutri credam, neutram absolvere possum à Calumniâ; neque enim innocentes esse possunt, qui aliis tam calumniose blasphemias impingunt. N. Grev. contra Smouliump. § 2. sec Act. Syn. Dord. scilicet. 107. p. 272.

thus

thus at Tennis, bandying Blasphemy as a Ball towards the faces of one another, and with such back-Blowes as alwaies Hit, he is so equal to both sides, as to clear them both from the guilt of Calumny. For whilst they charge each other with fearful Blasphemy, they both speak Truth, because they both are in an Error. They are the Conquerors and Captives of one another; and both sides must acknowledge, that if there is Blasphemy but on one side, there must be Hellish contumely on the other. Now with which of these should I have sided to have freed my self from Corruptory Correction? Not with the Sublapsarians; for the Sublapsarians would have told me that I had fallen into the Frying pan; nor with the Supralapsarians neither; for the Supralapsarians would have told me that I had leap'd into the Fire.

3. Doctor Abbot Bishop of Sarum, whom my Adversary Bishop Abries are so forward to alleage in their behalf, is one of those Reeds on which the harder they lean, the farther he runs through their Elbow. For he calls their opinion of the Absolute Decree of Reprobation a very sewre opinion, and as much as may be to be abhorred, an upstart opinion, and before those times never heard of in the Church, an opinion which he had sometimes indeed endeavoured to excuse, but never embraced it as his own; and had found it by experience to be very dangerous, and pernicious, and far remote from salutary Doctrine.] If he abhorred that doctrine for it self, how much more must he have hated its sad effects? if he was ever heartily of that opinion which he calleth pernicious, it was but natural, that being a convert, he should detest it so much the more.

fare tentavimus, nunquam amplexi sumus, usu autem ipso didicimus, quam perniciofa, quam periculosa, quam a salutari doctrina aliena sit. Rob. Sarisbur. de Gra. & persever. Sancti in præf. ad Lect. p. 11.

4. In the judgment of Du Moulin, (one of the learn'd Protestants the French Church hath enjoyed) [they are not Lovers of Gods glory, nor make any scruple to dis-
Glorie divina amantes sunt, & conscientias turbare metunt, &c. in Epist. I. Junii edita Hagæ, 1617.

z Gesselius
in speciminis
c. 13. p. 52.

* The Div.
Phil. Def. c.
3. Sect. 3 1.
p. 124, 1 25.

*Quis non regem
abominetur sic
loquentem? E-
go hunc homi-
nem addico sus-
pendio; sed ut
juste suspende-
atur, volo pa-
tret homicidi-
um vel Pecula-
tum. Moulin
in Anat.*

Arm. c. 12. p. 73. (a) Piscator in Resp. ad Dupl. Vorst. part. 1. p. 210.

*Prosper, ob-
cienti, quando
servi Domi-
nos occidunt,
ideo fieri, qui-
a ira Deus
Prædestinavit
ut fieret,] re-
sponder, si Di-
abolo objcere-
tur, quod tali-*

*um facinorum ipse Autor, ipse esset Incentor, puto quod aliquâ ratione exonerare se hac
posset Invidiâ, & talium scelerum patratores de ipsorum voluntate convinceret, —
probarer se non intulisse vñ criminum. Quâ ergo dementiâ definitur ad Dei referen-
dum esse consilium, quod nec Diabolo in totum ascribi potest, qui in peccantium flagitiis
illecebrarum Adjutor, non voluntatum credendus est esse Generator? Nihil ergo ta-
lium negotiarum Deus prædestinavit ut fieret nec illam animam nequiter turpiterque
visitaturam, ad hoc ut taliter viveret, præparavit: sed talem futuram non ignoravit, & de ta-
li justè se judicaturum esse præscivit, atque irâ ad prædestinationem ejus nihil aliud referri
potest, nisi quod aut ad debitam justitiæ retributionem, aut ad indebitam pertinet gratiæ
lasciviam. Prosp. ad Objec. Vincent. 11. p. 341, 342.*

" quiet Consciences, who say that God doth destroy or repro-
" bate his Creatures, meerly because it is his pleasure, and
" not because they do deserve it.] yet we know (z) who they
are, though 'tis not easie to know their number, who say
" that men are reprobated, not for their sins, but meerly be-
" cause God will have it so. And how angry Dr. Twisse was
with learned Moulin, whom he called Arminian, not-
withstanding his Book against Arminius, and what other
hard words he was pleased to sling at him, as well as against
his other Brethren, I have * already observed in my account
of Mr. B.

5. Moulin also shewes the odiousness of an antecedent irre-
spective Decree of Reprobation, by the similitude of a King,
who secretly intending to hang a subject, should contrive to
make him a Malefactor, that he might justly send him to the
Gallows, that he might have something to hang him for.
But who (saith Moulin) would not abominate such a King?
and yet (a) Piscator saith plainly, that God [did therefore
predestine men to sin, that he might justly punish them.]
And thence perhaps Mr. B. calls him the Honest Piscator.

6. It will be yet of greater moment to ascend a little
higher, and consider the testimony of Prosper, who thinks
it so great an Injury to God Almighty, to say that sins are
" committed because God predestin'd that they should be com-
" mitted, that he believes those words had been injuriously
" spoken, had they been spoken of the Devil, because the
" Devil himself can but sollicit, and not compel us to do
" wickedly. And therefore God (saith he) did not predestin

" that

"that any of those things should be done. — He was not ignorant that such a wicked soul would be, and forsook that he would judge it for such commissions. Nor can any thing more be referred to Gods Predestination, than that he doth render Justice where it is due, and bestow mercy where it is not.] This is the Sum of that famous Chapter. Which is as contrary to the Doctrine of Mr. B. and his Masters, as any thing can be invented. The chief thing observable I take to be this, that, though there was nothing in the objection, but that, when Servants kill their Masters, or Parents violate their Daughters, it is therefore done, because God Predestin'd that it should be done; yet Prosper takes it for granted in the very beginning of his answer, That God is inferred, by those words in the objection, to be the Author and Incentor of such abominations. Of which if the Devil were accused, he might in part clear himself, because he enforceth no man to sin, but only helps and assists him in it. Observe now the contrariety betwixt Prosper and those men whom I oppose. Prosper saith [It is a madness to refer that to Gods Counsel or Purpose which cannot wholly be ascribed to the Devil himself.] yet (saith Piscator) God made men [hoc (b) consilio] with this counsel, or to this purpose that they really might sin.] Again Prosper saith, that nothing of those affairs was predestin'd by God that it should be done. Yet (saith Mr. Barlee) God wills that sin should fall out, p. 78. He is an absolute determiner in a sovereign way of the several acts of obedience, and Disobedience in relation to Them, p. 88. He did voluntarily decree that sin shall fall out, p. 73. (nor can Mr. B. mean a conditional, but an absolute Decree, witness his principles, & what he saith, p. 88.) He doth determine that sin shall be done, p. 79. and may be said to tempt men unto sin, ibid. and many the like, but also may much worse as hath been shewed.

b Johan. Piscator. Theſ. 27. & 33.

7. The late Primate of Armagh hath from the very Patrons of that Cause which I oppose, put this confession upon Record, [That he doth evidently and horribly blasphemous as can be wished.

Qui necessitatem peccandi Deum intulisse hominib. inferre dicit, horribiliter in Deum blasphematur, quem Autorem peccati esse confirmat. Hist. Gottes. Cap. 10. p. 138.

against

See the Catalogue of Blasph. in the Divine Philan. Def: c. 3. p. 132. & seq.

* Piscator in Prefat. Disp. de predest. p. 8:

d Correp. Cor. p. 221, 222.

"gainst God, who saith that he imposeth any necessity of sinning upon his Creatures, because he thereby makes him to be the Author of sin, by compelling men thereunto,] yet these men say, that God (c) necessitates sin, that it cannot possibly but come to pass, and that he secretly thrusts men on to those sins which he forbid's, and when Mr. Barlee justifies the like expression in Mr. Calvin, he adds his own wit to it, and illustrates God's stirring up of sinners by a mans setting of Spurs to a Dull Jade, p. 61. and whilst he saith that God is not blamable in so doing, he skips from the Question, which is not [whether God doth sin,] but [whether he willetth the sins of his Creatures, and impels them to wicked acts,] so that he saith in effect the same with Piscator, who endeavours to blaspheme κατ' ἐννομον, and to be civilly injurious against his maker, by saying, [that God doth * holily thrust men on unto wickedness, that he may punish sins with sins.] And this perhaps may be the reason, why Mr. B. will not hear of any fall from Grace either final, or Total, and why he is so (d) indulgent to Davids Adultery and Murder, (how much soever aggravated by many foul and black circumstances) as to say, they did not place him in a state of damnation, but only robb'd him of the joy of it; of which what reason can be rendred except this one, that David was a better Adulterer, and committed a wilfull premeditated murder more holily and unblameably than other men? as if his sins were the lesse damning by being committed against a clearer light, and against greater obligations, and against more means of Grace, than what is afforded to the Reprobates. But farther,

Remigius Lugdunensis accounts it all one to necessitate sin, and to be the Author of it. Hist. Gotschal. c. 11. p. 173. Reg. 5. jecture.

8. The famous Archbishop of Lions, who is reckoned by them a Patron too, will be as much in their disfavour as I have been whilst they shall reflect upon what he saith on "the same occasion, viz. That if God had brought upon any man a necessity of doing wickedly, he had been then the Author of sins.] how much for my opinion, and against them whom I oppose, my opponents themselves may now Con-

9. Bishop. *Cuthbert Tunstall*, having pronounced it to be more than a hellish Blasphemy, to say that God is the Author of sin, (as appears by the place already cited) proceeds to discover the very Grounds of so great Impiety, and those he judgeth to be Three; viz. the Doctrines or Tenents, 1. That every will of God is a Decree, and unrevocable. 2. That Predestination is instead of Fate. 3. That the fore-knowledge of God doth imprint a necessity on what is future. Which he therefore thinks needfull to be confuted as the original of the evil, and accordingly sets about it in three distinct Chapters.

irrefragabilem. 2. Predestinationem Fati vicem habere. 3. præscentiam rei eventura inferr. cap. 1. p. 6. & seq.

These things being spoken of our Adversaries Doctrines, even by them who are wont to be reckoned upon as Patrons, they may receive their confirmation from other Protestant writers. But I will first mention one who is too old to be a Protestant, although an Orthodox member of the very same Church.

10. The Anonymous Author of the book intituled [*Prædestinatorum Hæresis*] one of St. *Austin's* Contemporaries set out by learned *Sirmondus*, doth reckon the opinion of unconditional Degrees to be none of the least of all those Heresies of which his Book is composed, and accordingly give's it this solemn Title.

"The ninetieth Heresy, which asserteth, that sins are committed by the Predestination of God.

destinatione Peccata committi. l. 2. p. 69. l. 3 p. 71.

11. Certainly *Grotius* (if ever any man did) understood the Importance of words and phrases; he knew when an Inference was right or wrong; and out of what things, what be such, as affirming God to be the Author of sin. *Omnium Scelerum Auctorem faciunt, cum docent, ad peccatum quæ peccatum præordinatos esse, &c. Reprobos verò prædestinatos esse ad hanc conditionem, ut non queant non varia scelera admittere, eosq; Necessitate peccati constringi, & quidem sine respiciendi. Deum operari Impium ad peccatum, ne penam ei justè infligere non possit Hoc consilio conditos homines, ut laberentur. Deum cum hominem ad Necessitatem Peccati necessitat, justè agere, quia potentiam habet gubernandi, ut vult, Deum operari omnia etiam in Impiis. Deum esse, qui ad pravas actiones incitet, seducat, trahat, jubeat, inducet, deceptiones immittit à Deo externè ad salutem vocari, quibus immutabili decreto statuit eam non conferre, Grot. de Antichristo p. 64, 65.*

things.

things do follow. But he affirmeth [that those men do make God to be the Author of all the Villanies in the world, who say that men are predestinated to sin as sin; that Reprobates are predestin'd to this condition, that they are constrained with a necessity of sinning, and that without repentance; that God doth all the wicked to sin, that he may punish him justly; that men were made to this purpose, that they might fall; that God doth justly when he necessitates men to sin, because he hath the power to govern as he will; that God worketh all things in all, yea even in the wicked; that it is God who seduceth, draveth, commandeth, hardeneth, inciteth to wicked actions; and that they also are called outwardly to Salvation, upon whom God purposed not to bestow it by an immutable Decree.] This is that that makes God to be the Author of sin in the unparalleled judgement of that Great man, and although he doth not name the Authors of those several expressions, yet the Authors of them are so obvious, that I am very well able to name the Books and pages where they are written, and shall do it as readily as any Adversary will have me.

Grotius his
Judgment of
those do-
ctrines, which
make God an
Abettor and
Incourager of
sin. *Omnium
scelerum' Fau-
torem faciunt,
cum doceant,
Fideles in Ad-
ulteria, homi-
cidium, Prodi-
tiones prolabi
posse, non ta-
men unquam à
gratia excide-
re; manere
enim semper*

viros secundum Cor Dei; neque peccata illis obfuturus, quia peccata praterita & futura jam remissa esse. Fideles per peccata ulla etiam gravia, non posse à Dei Gratia ad tempus excidere; opinionem verò contrariam esse Pygme Credulitatis, atque à Diabolo profectam. Id. ib.

12. He adds another sort of the same mens Aphorismes, whereby they speak God to be the cherisher of sins; as when they teach, [that the faithful can fall into Adulteries, Murders, Treasons, but yet they can never fall from Grace, but do still remain men after Gods own heart; nor are their sins any hinderance or disadvantage to them, because all their sins are remitted both past and future. That the faithful cannot fall from the Grace of God by any grievous sins, no not so much as for a time, and that the contrary opinion savours of heli-
lism Incredulity, and proceedeth from the Devil, and many more maxims of this kind may be collected (saith Grotius) from this kind of men. And because the Augustan confession which is unpassionately, purely, and discreetly protestant, doth condemn those Doctrins which are taught by those men, who call themselves Protestants as well as we,

and Reformers (forsooth) of our very Reformation; I did therefore in my Notes prefer the *Augustan confession* to any other of the Protestants except our own: and thence Mr. B. was so unhappy as to tell the world, that out of pure love to the *Augustan confession* I am extremely addicted to the *Misuse of Ceremonies*, with how profound an *Incongruity*, English Scholars may now judge.

II. The most learned Bishop Mountagne, with whom, for knowledge of *Antiquity* perhaps there have not been many who will compare, hath left these words upon Record in his very Appeal to King James, (whom my Assistant hath quoted as an utter Enemy to *Arminius*) “un-
“lesse from damned Hereticks, or stoical Philosophers, I ne-
“ver yet read in *Antiquity*, of any prime, previous determi- Error of
ning Decree, by which men were irrespectively denyed grace, Appel. Cesar.
“excluded from Glory, or enforced to Salvation. c. 7. p. 68,
69.

Bp. Mounta-
gues censure
of irrespectiue
Decrees with-
out relation
to those worst
effects of the
Error of
which I spake.
Appel. Cesar.
c. 7. p. 68,
69.

Should I set down the censures of as many writers as I am able, wherewith my Adversaries Doctrins have been condemned, I should hardly make an end before the Greek Calends. I hope that these are sufficient to convince my Reverend Antagonist, that I was not the first, much less the only Person, who hath spoken severely of those opinions, in opposition to which my Notes were written; and that few have ever spoken of them with greater Patience and moderation than I there did; and that He by consequence hath misplaced his reprehensions; and under pretence of beating me, hath struck at those Authors whose words I have alleged in this long Section, and (whether purposely, or through Incogitancy, I cannot tell) he hath scourged them all upon my Back. Not only Grotius and such as hee, but Irenaeus, nay Polycarp, St. Austin and Prosper, nay, the Arausican Councel, Bishop Abbot, and Bishop Hall, nay Remigius himself, and the whole Church of Lyons, Peter Moulin, and Melancthon, nay Doctor Whitaker himself, * See also
His own Brethren of the upper, and lower way, nay Doctor Mr. Baxters
* Twisse and Mr. Calvin have not escaped him. These are Dr. Twisse speeches of
not all whom I have cited in vindication of my severity which shall be recited ch. 5.
against those Doctrines which are severe against God. Sect. 3.

G

Amongst

Amongst them *all*, there is not a *Bellarmino*, or a *Bolsec*, though in such a point as this is, they are as fit to be heard as any others, because the points debated are neither *Protestant*, nor *Papist*; or if they are either, they are both. And when the question is, whether *black* or *white* is the lighter Colour, or least fit for mourning, I suppose a *Papists* Judgment upon that matter may be allow'd; They having sense, and reason, and erudition, as well as we. Besides, The *Papists* do cast no more upon *Protestants*, than upon those other *Papists*, who jump with the *Calvinists* in these opinions. Nor do the *Protestants* cast more upon the *Papists*, than upon those other *Protestants*, who jump with the *Papists* in these opinions. Nor do the *Papists* say worfe of the *Protestants*, than some *Protestants* do of *Papists*. And if my *Assailant* knew this before I told him, I wish he had considered as well as known it. But (not to speak of their suffrages) if those unquestionable Authors, whom I have cited, have only beaten the precious spices as so many *Confectioners*, merely to draw out the fragrant sent, I do not envie their being beaten, but am very well content that they smel as sweetly as they are able.

6. 8. Eighthly, Now I have shewed what it was upon which I fastned the charge of *Blasphemy*, and that I could not in charity or in conscience, have spoken less than I did; I cannot but mark in the next place the transcendent partiality of Dr. Reynolds, who having timely perused the whole *Correptory Correction*, before it was sent unto the Presse, whilst yet it was capable of some Amendment, was yet so far from blotting out those vast excesses of Rayling which his eyes beheld in every page, (against my person, and my opinion, and against every great Author who seemed to stand in his way,) that he rather endeavour'd to prove it lawful; nor only lawfull, but even necessary in writings of this nature, (they are his own words.) He farther prompted him to a Text to comfort him up in his commissions. And so the *Correptory Corrector* being [an *ἐκδοσίμω*,] a Favourite, or white Boy, may be allowed to frame a charge of *Atheism* both [Major and

and *Minor*] against all that agree not to [*Gods necessitating of sin* ;] His Book may be commended as an elaborate and "learned piece, for calling slanderous Dragon, and noon-day "Devil, Satanical Blasphemer, an excedder of the Devil himself in Blasphemy, worse than Diabolical, and a maker of "God to be worse than the Devil. Whereas when I did but distinguish of modest Blasphemers, and such as were for *Ligonem, Ligonem*, (without the naming of any person,) that is, of such as speak God to be the Author of sin in those very broad and down-right Terms, and of such as say the same thing in terms *lesse blunt*, I was surprised from the Presse with a chiding Preface, and modestly accused of *immodesty*, and implicitly affirmed to be of *Bolses's complexion*, and all this by a Person professing Friendship and Civility.

But now I hope he will confess, that I had great and weighty Reasons, to say that the *Manichees* and *Marcionites* were not so bad in their Assertions; as they who teach, with contention, that God is the Author or cause of sin; and for this I have the judgement of (e) *Irenaeus*, who saith, c ταῦτα δὲ γ-
ματα ὁ δὲ εἰ that the *Hereticks* never durst to entertain such an opinion, ἔξω τῆς ἐκ- as should but seem to make God the Author of sin. He κλησίας ἀρε- speaks of *Hereticks* in general, of all that were without the πικρὴ ἐπολμυ- Church; and no doubt but (f) *Carpocrates* as well as σαν ἀπορήνα- (g) *Marcion*, was in his memory and his mind, because he δου πύτη. hath written concerning the *Heresies* of both. Was it not bet- Iren. in Epist.
ad Flo. p. 510: ter, or *lesse ill*, to make two principles coeternal, the one Edit Colon. distinctly of good, the other distinctly of evil, than to as- f. Idem, l. i. cribe all evil to the God of all goodness? 'Bate but the word c. 24. Coeternal, and we shall find it good Doctrine, that of good g. Idem l. i.
c. 29. and evil there are two distinct principles; God of the first, and *Lucifer* of the second. Now those *Hereticks* not believing the liberty of the will, and thereupon not understanding, that without the liberty of the will of the Creature, no imaginable wickedness could ever have come into the world, they concluded that God must be its Author. But then again considering, that the very same fountain cannot yield both killing and healing water, and that the best as well as

worst fruit doth never grow from one Tree, and that uncleannesse as well as purity could not possibly issue from the very same God, they found it safer to conclude, that there were two distinct Gods to be the contrary principles of good and evil, than that the very same God should be the Fountain and source of both, so that the Heresie of Marcion may seem to be in this respect a degree of Reformation: for though he ran into a mischief extremely great, yet it was with an intent to escape a greater. And if it were not so as I have said, why was it said by Irenaeus, that the Hereticks themselves had never the boldnesse to affirm, that the God of holinesse and purity was the original Fountain or Cause of sin?

So far was Carpocrates from such a boldnesse, that being not able to discern, how the will of men and Angels was able to choose the things forbidden and to refuse the things commanded, and thereby to be the cause of sin; he rather chose to say, that there is no sin at all, that good and evil are only words and only differ in the fancies and opinions of men, than to say that one God is the cause of both. For if all things are done by Gods will and decree, they must all be good, because he will'd and decreed them. But Carpocrates thought then (what our Adversaries say now) that all things are done, without exception, by Gods will and decree; upon which he concluded that all things are good without exception; and that sin, as well as conscience, is nothing else but a political or Ecclesiastical word. So that his foul Heresie of making no sin at all, in comparison of the other which feigneth God to be its Author, may also seem a pretender to some Degree of Reformation.

From both these cases it doth appear, that the very worst of the worst opinions, must be that which makes God to be the Author of sin, and when men are frighted by such a Fiend to fly for sanctuary to any thing that lyeth next, let every rational man judge how smooth a passage lay open for such as Carpocrates and Marcion, to enter, and lye down, and nuzzle themselves in an opinion that there is no God at all; and that Atheisme it self is a comparative Reformation; (that is) a flying out of the greatest into somewhat a lesser evil.

evil. All which mischiefs would be avoided, if men were
 so humble as to acknowledge, that they *themselves* are the
Authors of sin and misery. ² That their *Wills* are *free*, and
 not necessitated to sin. ³ That being free, they can *choose*
 either to *shun*, or to *embrace* it. ⁴ That God's *withholding* of
 grace is no mans *guilt*, but mans *abusing* of grace which God
 afforded. ⁵ That God expecteth to receive after the mea-
 sure that he hath given. ⁶ That no man living can be con-
 demned for never having had a *Talent*, but for having been
 an ill servant in wilfully *squandering* it away, or in the wilful
 neglect of its *Improvement*. And now I hope it is evident
 from all that hath hitherto been spoken, that there was
 reason and modesty in all I said concerning modest and im-
 modest *Blasphemers*, who say *directly*, or *indirectly*, That God
 is the *Author and cause of sin*. And therefore

* Christ him-
 self hath made
 them free
 (Gal. 5. 1.)
 of and to not left
 any necessity
 to sin & perish.
 Through
 Christ who
 strengthens
 them, as well
 by the preven-
 tions, as the
 further Assi-
 stances of his
 grace, they can
 choose to avoid;

§ 9. Ninthly, My Reverend Assailant is least of all to be
 excused, for that which he adds in the last part of this Para-
 graph. viz. [that their Lord and Brethren before them have
 met with the same measure. Mar. 2. 7. Mat. 26. 65. 13.
 Act. 6. 13.] But here I ask him, and let him answer if
 he is able, (and if he is not, let him confesse his error) Did
 Christ ever let fall such expressions as those, which I have
 proved to be blasphemous? Did our Lord and Master ever
 say, that men do break God's Law by God's own Impulse or
 Compulsion, or by his precept and command? That God can
 will that man shall not fall by his revealed will, and in the
 mean while ordain by his secret will, that the same man shall
 infallibly and efficaciously fall? Did our Saviour ever say
 so much as in appearance, That God doth make men Trans-
 gressors, That Adultery is the work of him the Author, mo-
 ver, and Impeller? That God's Decree is no less efficacious
 in the permission of evil, than in the production of good? That
 God doth not only prostitute men to sins and administer the oc-
 casions of sinning, but doth also so move and urge them, that
 they may smite the sinners minde, and really affect his imagi-
 nation?] Was He called Blasphemer for such things as
 these? and were not These the very things, upon which in
 my

sin whilst yet
 they are able
 to embrace it:
 alio (Phil. 4.

My Notes I laid my charge? Things confessed to be *Blasphemie* by the very *Authors* and *Patrons* of them, when in their *sober fits* or *lucid Intervals*, they look upon them as spoken by *other men*? See the matchless absurdity of the comparison, by consulting those *Texts* to which my Adversary refers us. [*Jesus said to the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee*; upon which said the *Scribes within their hearts*, *why doth this man thus speak blasphemies*? Mark "2. 7.] *Jesus* professed to *Filate*, that he was the *Christ* "the son of God, whereupon the *High Priest* rent his cloaths, "saying, *He hath spoken blasphemie, what farther need have we of witnesses*? Behold now ye have heard his *Blasphemy*. "Mat. 26. 65.] *St. Stephen* did miracles among the people, "and disputed against the *Jews*; and therefore they suborned "men to say, that they heard him speak blasphemous words. Acts 6. 11, 13.] Let these sayings of *Christ* and of *St. Stephen* be well compared with the sayings of *Mr. Calvin* and his *Disciples*, and we shall find the difference to be as great, as betwixt *Christ* and *Calvin*, betwixt the followers of *Christ*, and the followers of *Calvin*, betwixt *St. Stephen*, and *Dr. Twisse*, or betwixt me, and those *Jews* in our several Churches. And here I challenge his answer to this Dilemma, Did our Lord and *St. Stephen* meet with the very same measure from the *Jews*, which the men whom I cited received from me, or did they not? If he shall answer that they did, then must he prove that the sayings of those men whom I cited were as far from *blasphemy* as the saying of *Christ* and *St. Stephen*; or that the sayings of *Christ* and *St. Stephen* had as much of *blasphemie* in them, as those which I cited for making God to be the *Author of sin*. But if he shall answer that they did not, he must not only eat his words in a Corner. but make publick satisfaction; not only to me, but to every one of those *Authors* whom I have quoted in this chapter, speaking much more sharply, than I have done. He alone is to be blamed, that this Dilemma doth fall so very heavily upon him. It was no fault of mine, that he would needs utter that, which reflecteth upon him with so much sharpnesse, but on the contrary I wish, and I wish

SECT. I. *An Injurious Accuser.*

47

with it heartily, that he had either brought me an harder argument, or at least that he had given me a softer word.

CHAP. V.

E. R.

“*There have been men of great Learning, and
not wholly devoted to the Judgment of Calvin,
who have taught even Dissenters thus to say of him,* B. Andrews,
“*Calvino, illūstri viro, nec unquam sine summi* opusc. p. 115.
“*honoris præfatione nominando, non assentior.*

T. P.

§ 1. **B**Ehold the utmost that I can gather from this third way of arguing. Men of great learning have spoken honourably of Calvin, therefore I have done ill to call that blasphemie whereby God is concluded to be the Author of sin. It might suffice me to say, that I deny his Sequel, but I have something to say besides: for first there is not a Page in all my Notes, wherein I give Mr. Calvin the least dishonourable Term. I fairly name him and cite his words, and consider the matter of which he speaks, and shew the reason of my dislike, and so I am sure did Bishop Andrews; and therefore this paragraph is nothing at all to the purpose, unless it would intimate to the Reader that I had said of Mr. Calvin, what its Author knows I never did, if I have forgot, and he remembers, let him do me the justice to name the time, or the place.

G 4

§ 2. Hc

§ 2. He confesseth that *Bishop Andrews* had his dislikes to *Calvin*, and that himself doth not *jurare in verba*, either of *Calvin*, or any other, amongst whom *Dr. Twisse* must needs be one, and why might not I dissent from either? And offer my arguments or reasons against their Doctrine, whilst (he knows) I meddled with nothing else? I spake indeed of *Blasphemers* without applying the word to any person in particular; yet I meant it of all in general, who have any way affirmed God to be the Author of sin. But my Adversary applied it to *Mr. Calvin* and *Dr. Twisse*, which why should he have done, unless he thought he had reason for it, by verily believing that they were guilty? Yet he compares me to the *Jews* imputing *Blasphemy* to *Christ*. How much better had he applied it unto the *Corruptor* *Corruptor* who suborn'd falsewitnesse (a Reverend Minister he call'd him, but no man living can tell where he dwells) to make me a *Ranter*, and a *what-not*? Fictions, as remote from all probability, as well as truth, as the wit of *Calumny* could have removed them, whereas I spake not a word of *Mr. Calvin* or *Dr. Twisse*, which was so much as uncivil, much less untrue. I had no such word, as *Calvino-Turcismus*; nor did I call him an *Enemy* to the three persons in the *Trinity* for calling them (h) *Tres proprietates*; nor did I call him an enemy to the *Nicene Creed*, for not approving of *Christ's* being (h) *God of God*; nor did I say (with *Hunnius*,) *Calvinus Judaizans*; or that the fault of (k) *Impertinence* and *falshood* was laid by *Calvin* to the charge of three *Evangelists*, *St. Matthew*, *Mark*, and *John*; nor did I call *Mr. Calvin*, as *Mr. Calvin* called others, viz. *Serpent*, *Pest*, *Fool*, *Hangman*, *Knave*, *Devil*, *Impudent Impostor*, and *filthy Dog*.] These and others without number, are *Mr. Calvin's* own Terms, which he frequently heapeth upon great and good Men; yet every Reader is my witness, that I did not fasten on *Mr. Calvin* any one uncomely or unfriendly Epithete, though *Bucer* himself had called him *Fratricide*: so I can say of *Dr. Twisse*, that I did not call him *Antinomian*, as he is said to have been called in the *Assembly* of *Divines* but whether truly or falsely, I cannot tell. I can name

h h Grot. in
Voto pro Pa-
ce p. 15.
& Hunnius
apud Grot.
Discuss. River.
Apol. p. 115,
186.

Sect. 3. By whom accused, and of what.

49

name a worthy person who professeth to have read it in Mr. Baxter. Nor did I use him as others use me; nor as he himself was wont to use others. I had to do with his *Doctrine* but not with his *person*.

§ 3. To conclude. If my *Affailant* is so zealous of other Mens good Names, as to complain of me in publick for meerly seeming to be injurious, In how tragical a manner must he needs protest against that great number of Ministers (all, I think, of his party) who have reckon'd the Reverend Doctor Hammond, (a person never to be mention'd without a preface of Honour and Veneration) amongst the (l) Cursed Blasphemers, the (m) abominable erroneous, and the (n) Damnable Hereticks of the Times, alleaging no better reason than this which follows, That in his practical Catechism he had used these words [(o) Christ was given to undergo a shameful Death, voluntarily upon the Crosse, to satisfie for the sin of Adam, and for all the sins of Mankind.] Whosoever shall compare these few plain words both with the (p) Articles of the Church of England, and with the whole Tenor of the (q) Scriptures, he will think it somewhat more than wonderful, that Men should be so unlucky in their Devices, as to rank the greatest Maxime of Christian Religion amongst the greatest Abominations that they were able to describe. And which if it had been a Blasphemy, they themselves had been guilty of the thing which they condemned, by having said it in effect in the very same Book. p. 32. line 14, 15, 16, 17. Or if he will not be severely sensible of this irreverence to Dr. H. yet what damnatory sentence will he pronounce on Mr. Baxter, who hath laid to the charge of Mr. Pemble and Dr. Twisse, (r) That their own mistake of Justification's being an immanent Act of God did lead them to that error and Pillar of Antinomianism, viz. Justification from Eternity? adding further in the same Book [(s) That they fought against Jesuits and Arminians with the Antinomian Weapons, and so they ran into the far worse Extreme, and immediately after undertakes to demonstrate, that [The Doctrine of Christ's immediate

1 A Testimony to the Truth of l. C. in Praef. p. 2. m Ibid. p. 4. n Ibid. p. 9.

p. Art. Eccl. Angl. 2. 7, 15, q 1 John 2. 2. Heb. 2. 9. John 4. 42. 1 Tim. 4. 10. 2 Pet. 3. 9. Act. 17. 30.

r Aphorisms of Justif. Thes. 36. p. 173.

s Idib. Append. p. 163, 164.

H

" actual

t Saints ever-
last. Rest. part.
3. c. 3. sect. 2. in
marg. p. 40, 41.

u Idib. part. 3.
c. 2. sect. 15. p.
38. in marg.

* Saints ever-
last. Rest. part.
1. c. 8. sect. 2.
p. 154.

“ actual Delivering us from guilt, wrath, and condemnation,
“ is the very Pillar and Foundation of the whole Frame and Fa-
“ brick of Antinomianism.] And what his Thoughts are of
the Antinomian Faith, he hath expressed (t) elsewhere by
[A believing the Devil the Father of Lyes, and not God, yea
“ against God; A resting on the deceiving Promise of the Devil
“ for justification; (and are not such like to be well justified by
“ their Accuser?) nay, it is a making the Devil their God, &c.]
Not many Pages before this, He had laid it to the charge of
the same Dr. Twisse, that [(u) The physical active Determina-
“ tion of Mans Will to sin, or the act which is sinful, by Gods
“ effectual Influx, is asserted by him.] professing also just be-
fore, that [He detested their Doctrine and way of preaching,
“ who teach Men to lay the chief cause of their sin and Dam-
“ nation from themselves on God, and would have wicked men
“ believe that none but the Elect do sin against the Price that
“ was paid for them, and so would quiet their Consciences in
“ Hell, as if they were not guilty of any such sin.] Now if Dr.
“ Twisse was so eminent a servant of Christ and so deeply ac-
“ quainted with the mind of God, as my Assailant is pleas'd
to dictate, his next Assault (I suppose) ought to be
made on Mr. Baxter. of whom he hath also been elsewhere
shewed, that he hath spoken not a little to the Discredit of
* Mr. Calvin.

CHAP. VI.

E. R.

But it is no new thing to draw invidious consequences
“ from such opinions as we have a mind to render
“ odious unto the world. A Fate which hath ever fol-
“ lowed these controversies from the beginning of
“ them, Nine or ten Pelagian Calumnies, Austin, that
“ renowned

Se^ct 1. By whom accused and of what.

51

"renowned Champion of Grace, is put to remove in
 "his second and third Books, contra duas Episto
 "las Pelagianorum. In the Epistles of Prosper and
 "Hilary unto him, we find many heavy consequents
 "charged by the Massilians, upon his Doctrīne, de
 "vocatione secundum propositū & de Præde-
 "stinatione, that it giveth occasion of sinning, makes
 "men careless of standing; careless after lapses of ri-
 "sing again, taketh away all industry and regard of
 "virtue, induceth a Fatal Necessity, weakneth vigour
 "of preaching, is contrary to the edification of hear-
 "ers, rendreth fruitless all Christian Correction, and
 "driveth men into Despair. Tea that holy man, or
 "Prosper his Follower (for the work goes under both
 "Names) was fain to confli^ct with these very objecti-
 "ons of Gods making men to destroy them, and of his
 "being the Author of sin. And after that, the same ob-
 "jections were made against the same Doctrīne of
 "Austin under the odious name of Hæresis Præde-
 "stinatiana, as the renowned Bishop Usher, & lear-
 "ned Camero have observed. And the same we find
 "revived in handling the same Controversies in our
 "days, rendring those opinions odious which please us
 "not, as sore Impediments unto true Piety, by the Au-
 "thor of the Book, called God's love to Mankind,
 "and others. From which charge they have been suffi-
 "ciently vindicated, as of old by Prosper, Aquita-
 "nicus, Remigius, Lugdunensis, and others, so of
 "late by those learned men, who have answered the
 "forenamed Book. But this being a taking Medium,
 "I find also used by the Socinians. Jonas Schliti-
 "gius hath written a disputation against Meisner a
 "Lutheran Divine, in defense of Socinus to this
 "very effect.

Vide etiam con-
 tra Julian. l. 2.
 c. 1. & l. 3. c. 24.
 & l. 4. c. 3.

In resp. ad Ar-
 tic. falsò sibi
 impositos in E-
 dit. Bas. Prosper
 ad Capit. object.
 Vincent.
 Histor. Gotsch.
 c. 2, 3. Amica
 Collatio p. 294.

Prosp. ad Cap.
 Gal. Hist. Gov
 reschale. c. 5.

T. P.

§ 1. It is impossible to conceive wherein the *hardnesse* of this *fourth* argument doth lie. Here are many *premisses* to one purpose very plainly *expressed*, from which the *conclusion* is very *bashfully implied*. Observe Reader how it stands. *Austin* was put to remove 9. or 10. *Pelagian Calumnies*, the *Massilians* charged many heavy consequents on his *Doctrin*, his *Doctrin* was objected against under the name of *Hæresis Prædestinatiana*, &c. Ergo, what? The *Conclusion* (if any) must needs be this, that Mr. T. P. hath done like the *Pelagians* & *Massilians*, (& like the *Socinians* against *Meissner*) in setting down the *express words* of some *modern Writers* whom he did not name neither. And so here is the *Fallacy of Ignoratio Elenchi*, which the *unconsidering Reader* may chance to swallow, if the *palate* of his judgement is so thickly paved, as not to feel it or taste it in *gliding down*. But every Reader who is awake will find a strange *Incongruity* betwixt the *Premises* and the *Conclusion*; for first, *those* in the *premisses* did name *St. Austin*. Secondly, they did not set down his own very words. Thirdly, they drew such consequents from *Austins* words, which were *disavowed* by him and *Prosper* but never justified by either of them: whereas my case (which must be his *conclusion*, if he own any pertinence of all here spoken) doth differ from that [*Si hoc nunc*] as much as may be: for first, I (*w*) named not the Authors whom I accused. Secondly, I set down their very words. Thirdly, The *Correptory Correptor* was so far from disavowing those *frightful speeches*, that he (*x*) *indeavoured to justify*, and make them good. And as my *irreverent*, so also my *Reverend Adversary* doth not scruple to cloak them with *pretensions* even of *Scripture*. But the *Correptory Correptor* was not satisfied with that he said, that the *expressions* of *holy Scripture* do go* beyond the very highest of either moderate or bold *Blasphemers*, (though some of them affirmed God to be the

w *Corrept. Copy of Notes.*

p. 9. & 10. x See the 10. last sections of the Divine Philan. defended.

* *Corrept. Cor.* p. 56.

Author

Author of Adultery, and not onely the *Author* but the *Impeller* too,) accusing all Men of (γ) *Atheism* who will not give him their *suffrage*. Id. ib. p. 141.
118 56. & 68.

§ 2. 'Tis true that *Auslin* and *Prosper* did vindicate themselves from the Pelagian Calumnies, as I have vindicated myself from the more groundless Calumnies of the worse *extream*; and 'tis a most pleasing observation, that they did so vindicate themselves, as to declare their *Detestation* of all those Doctrins which I condemned, and their express *Approbation* of those very Doctrins which I asserted. He that shall read *St. Auslins* answers *ad Articulos sibi falso impositos*, *Prossers* answers *ad Capitula objectionum Gallorum*, and his other answers to the objections of *Vincentius*, will say, that my Reverend Assailant could not possibly have done me a greater favour, than to produce those things to my prejudice (as he thought it) which I have often (z) urged to my advantage. z See The Div.
Philanth. ch. I.
sect. 5. p. 29.

§ 3. His mention of the Book called *Gods love to Mankind*, hath proved also a favour to me. For having sent for that Book on this occasion, I find the *Author* of it a Convert from the Sect which he there opposeth. He professeth in the entrance to give the reasons, by which he was moved to (a) change his opinion in some controversies debated between the Remonstrants and their opposites. And (not to speak of his other reasons) the second reason of his change he (b) professeth to be this, that the opinion which he forsook (to wit, the opinion of the Calvinists which I have also forsaken upon the very same grounds) chargeth God with Mens sin on Earth, "and makes him the Author, not of the first sin only that entred by Adam into the World, but of all other sins that have been, are, or shall be committed to the Worlds end, no Murders, Robberies, Rapes, Adulteries, Insurrections, Treasons, Blasphemies, Heresies, Persecutions, or any other Abominations whatsoever fall out at any time, or in any place, but they are the necessary productions of Gods Almighty Decree. Behold the liberal and ingenuous Confession of

p. 1.
b p. 24. to.
p. 37.

Dr. Reynolds his Ignoratio Elenchi, Chap. 6.

of that *Conscientious* and learned Calvinist. First I say *Conscientious*, because he was not ashamed to retract his errors, nor to publish his *Retraction*; nor did he fear what might follow, by his contracting the displeasures of a *revengeful party*; next I say *learned*, because he *Confuteth* his former judgement in an *unanswerable* manner; which is the likelier to be so, because an answer hath been attempted by the learnedst Men of that party, who could arrive no higher than to attempt it,) neither of them avowing the very same *Doctrins* which he opposed (and betray a dissatisfaction in each others performances, why else was it attempted by more than one ? Last of all I say *Calvinist*, as presupposed in his *Conversion*. He could not first cease to be a Calvinist, and then discover the reasons why, the motives to his Repentance must needs precede his change of life. He disliked that Sect, before he left it, however his leaving of it might tread upon the heels of his dislike.

§. 4. *Prosper, Aquitanicus, Remigius, Lugdunensis*, are thus distinguished vvith *Comma's* in that Edition of his *Epistle* unto the Corruptory Corruptor. As if four of the Antients had been instanced in, vvhereas *Prosper of Aquitanea* vvvas but one Man, and *Remigius of Lyons* was bnt another, nor he a very old one neither. But I suppose those *Comma's* the error only of the *Print-house*; all that I charge on my *Assailant* is his unreasonable mention of those two Men, very much to his prejudice, but not to his purpose in any kind, they having not vindicated the speeches of Mr. Calvin, *Zuinglius*, and Dr. *Twisse*, (they vvvere neither so young, nor yet so giddy) but vindicated themselves from being thought to be *Patrons* of those opinions, vvvhich by the three Men mentioned were since espoused, and (as I have partly already shewed, Chap. 4. §. 6, 7.) they did vindicate themselves, as well from those foul *Doctrins* which I discover and oppose, as from those very *calumnies* then framed against them.

CHAP. VII.

E. R.

But how ill it becometh Sons of the Reformed Church of England, to take up that charge, which Bolsec, Bellarmine, Becanus, Kellison, Fitzsimon, Stapleton, Fevardentius, and others of that party, have unjustly cast upon the worthy Instruments of God in the Reformation of the Church, and which have been so expressly disavowed, and so fully wiped off by a whole cloud of learned writers, (Some * few of whom I have *è meâ tenui supel-* * 31. Are named in his Margin, and being there but named, this Margin is not concerned in them, because not a syllable is produced of words, or matter a 38. Texts are referred to in the Margin, but the words not mentioned, much less explained, or applied to any one sentence which they are pretended to excuse.

le & in the Margin pointed unto,) I leave unto you to shew.

Sure we are, that upon a Candid examination, it will appear, that in this Argument, Protestant Divines have intended no more than Austin before them did say, whom none will by name accuse, for making God the Author of sin, though some, as Baronius observeth, dum in Novatores (so he calleth our Divines) insurgunt, à sancti Augustini sententia de prædestinatione recedunt. Nor have they intended any more than by multitudes of places of a Scripture they were led unto, which places as we read with Adoration and trembling, at the unsearchable judgements of God, so we cannot but with all submission acknowledge the holiness and Authority of them.

T. P.

T. P.

§. I.

ALL these Propositions thus put together do look as if they would be glad to have the force of a *fifth argument*, and though they have not the *luck* they have the *willingness* to infer,

e Correct. Copy of Notes. p. 9, & 10.

that I have done very ill in setting down that (c) Catalogue of Dr. *Twisse* his *expressions*, and two besides, *Calvin* and *Zuinglius*. But here he *miscarries* in as many respects as it was possible. For first, I did civilly conceal their *names*. Secondly, I cited their *naked words*, and therefore could not charge them *falsely*; if the words did *blush* to be seen in *English*, the fault was theirs who first *divulged* them in *Latin*. Thirdly, they were not all *Instruments* in the *Reformation of the Church*; for Dr. *Twisse* and Mr. *Calvin*, were far from being *Contemporaries*, and (as to the matters in debate) as far from being of *one opinion*; and that wherein Dr. *Twisse* had his *part*, and *presided*, was far from being a *Reformation*. Fourthly, they never *expressly disavowed* what I transcribed out of their *works*; or if they had done it, their crimes had been but so much the *greater*; nor am I to be Blamed, if other Men will say *foul things* in *print*, and then *disavow* the having said them. Fifthly, Doctor *Twisse* his speeches made up *half* my Catalogue; and so far have they been from being *fully wiped off by a whole Cloud of learned Writers*, that of the 31. Writers whom my Reverend

d The Div. Philan. Defen. ch. 3. sect. 31. p. 123, 124. & seq.

e Robert Sarisb. de Gratia & Perfer. sanct. in Præf. far. ad lector. p. 13.

Assailant is pleased to name for that purpose, there is not one that hath attempted to do him that *Favour*, much less they who were *dead* before he came into the world. Sixthly, so far is Dr. *Twisse* from excusing the *Sublapsarians*, that he *accuseth* them rather, like some *Bolsec* or *Bellarmino*, as I would here shew, if I had not done it enough (d) already. Seventhly, another whom he names is *Bishop Abbot*, who yet is as *bitter an enemy* to the *absolute decree of Reprobation*, as either *Bellarmino* or *Bolsec*. He calls it [a (e) *cruel opinion*

on,

on, contrary to Scripture, and to the Fathers of the Church, a wicked opinion, a (f) Rock of mischief to be avoided] f. p. 12. he speaks most severely of all the *Supralapsarians*, of Mr. (g) Perkins by Name, and by inevitable (g) Consequence of Dr. Twisse, he holds them as bad as the *Pelagians*; and professeth that their *Doctrins* do make men fly unto *Arminianisme* by way of Refuge: of whom I add no more, because I speak of him above, (viz. chap. 4. § 7.) Whosoever shall compare the places cited in *Bishop Abbot*, with Mr. Perkins and Dr. Twisse, will say that my *Assailant* should have thought a second time, before he put them into his *Catalogue*. Eighthly, nor was he less unfortunate in his pitching upon *Maccovius*, who in the *Synod at Dort* did very publicly contend, [That (h) God doth will sins, or-dain men to sin, as sin, and wills not by any means that all men should be saved, (as directly contrary to the Apostle as he could possibly have spoken) and as if this were not enough, he farther declared in the *Synod*, [that except these things were held and maintained by them, they must come over to the Remonstrants.] The Reader may now judge what is meant by my *Assailant* when he saith, that the charge which is brought against his party, is so fully wiped off by blunt *Maccovius*, and such as He. But what was done to *Maccovius* for those expressions? He was pronounced in the *Synod* to be pure and Orthodox, and only admonished as a Brother, to take heed hereafter of such words, as might give offence to tender Ears, and could not well down with those, who are yet incapable of such Mysteries.

g Idem in Thomasoni Diatribam, cap. 1. p. 83, 84.

h This the Reverent Assailant might have found in the Book by him mentioned called God's love to mankind. p. 3. And he alone is to be thanked for this Citation.

§ 2. By these three or four men, it will be easie to judge of all the rest in his *Inventory*, to whom notwithstanding I should have spoken in particular, if He had ventured to set down any one of their words: and had he seen any thing in them to his Advantage, I make no doubt but I should soon have heard of it, at least the *Correptory Correptor* would have found it out, whom it concern'd so nearly, and for whose assistance this *Catalogue* was so professedly intended. But I have made it appear, that he hath wiped them

fouler (if fouler may be) than they seemed to be before he wip'd them, (as I have seen some *Houses*, which however unclean in other respects, yet the *uncleanest* thing of all hath been the *Beesome*.) So that the *utmost* which I learn from the *long Catalogue* of writers, is this; that my *Reverend Antagonist* is the possessor of many Books, whose *Authors* being of his party do write in *favour* of his *opinions*, that is, of their own; and being *naturally* willing to be *well* enough thought on, they have done their *brotherly-endearments* to make the *best* of a *bad matter*, that the *Enormities* of the party may be abhorred so much the *less*. It is one thing to *excuse*, or *alleviate* a *Fact*, but quite another to plead its *Innocence*. *Bishop Abbot* did his endeavour to excuse the

k Non satis
consultit nomi-
ni suo, qui tan-
quam equum
quendam Tro-
janum Conten-
tionis tam dire
seminarium in-
tra Fidei Mu-
ros invexit.
Robert: Sa-
risb. in Præf.
ad lect. de
Persev. Sanct.
p. 11.

l Perkinsius
—erravit
errorem non le-
vem, cujus a-
doctis quibus-
dam viris ini-
ta jamdudum,

et suscepta defensione turbas Ecclesiis non necessarias dedit, quas etiamnum non sine Scandalo
et periculo herere videmus, dum, &c. Idem in Tom. Diatr. p. 1, 2. mihi 83, 84.

m Act. Synod. Dord. part 1. p. 3; 8. Sess. 144. n Act. Syn. Dord. part 1. Sess. 143.

p. 339, 340.

Doctrines of Mr. Perkins, although he call'd it the (k) *seminarie* of dire contention, which like some *Trojan Horse* was brought within the walls of Faith; and also (l) blamed those men (of whom Dr. Twisse must be the chief) who undertook the defence of so great an Error, as that which was not only troublesome, but dangerous and scandalous to the Church of God. In like manner Dr. Twisse doth sometimes labour to excuse the Synod at Dort, although he labours to confute it with all his might; and again doth bitterly inveigh against learned Moulin for his opinion of Reprobation, for which the Synod at Dort thought fit to (m) thank him. I say they thank'd him for all his Letter without exception of any period, although they could not but know, that he was perfectly (n) Arminian in what he said of Reprobation. It seems Du-Moulin was a Favourite, and (for his other opinions sake) to be commended even for that, for which a Remonstrant had had their *Correptory Correction*.

§ 3. How *inexcusable* the Doctrines of many Calvinists have been, and how little to be owned by the more ingenuous of their own party, the Reader may easily pass a judgement by these following observations: First the *Remonstrants*

strants were (o) *submonished* by the President of the Synod (who must be remembered to be *Bogerman*) not to exagitate the point of Reprobation, but rather to insist on the pleasant Doctrine of election; thereby discovering, where his shoes did most pinch him. Secondly, the Remonstrants submonition, affirm it to have been, that they meddle with Election, than with the (p) odious matter of Reprobation. And had they added the word *odious*, or put it in stead of *odious*, they had been certainly reprehended by them that had them in sub-

jection. Thirdly, from the beginning to the ending of that affair, the Synod would not indure to the Remonstrants could object against the Calvinists Doctrins of Reprobation, but commanded them to answer to all such Questions, as Mr. *Bogerman* should please to ask them.

Fourthly, there were (r) some in the Synod of more moderate dispositions, and fearing God, who did plead for a Rejection of such expressions, as appeared to make God the Author of

sin; which is a Token of their dislike, although they could not prevail against the Number of their Opponents; nor indeed is it a wonder, when such men as (s) *Triglandius* must have the composing of their Canons. Fifthly,

when they find such expressions in the (t) *Dominicans* writings, or the (t) *Iesuits*, they are forward enough to sling a stone at them, although they cannot look inward, and see themselves; Iure he that spies a Mote in his Adversaries Eye, commends not the Beam that is in his own. If *Ocham* and *Gabriel* are confessed by *Medina* to have said that God is the Cause of sin, and that in the rigour, or propriety of speech (t) Mr. B. will tell us, that we shall not find that expression in any Calvinist of Note, as if the men in my larger Catalogue had been obscure, if it is added by the Dominicans, that God determines the will of the Creature to every act of sin it self, * Dr. *Twisse* will say that the Calvinists have not discovered their judgement in terms so plain, *ratio*

(o) *Submonuit Praeses, ut potius questionibus illis inhaerent, quae circa suavem de electione doctrinam versantur, quam ut odiosae doctrinam de Reprobatione exagitant.* Act. Synod. Dord. part. 1. Sess. 32. p. 128.

repeating that they should re-

(p) *A. R. D. Praeside moniti sumus, ut à negativis abstereremus, & de Electione potius, quam odiosae Reprobationis materia ageremus.* Ib. Sess. 34. p. 133.

(q) *bear what* q Ibid. a Sess. 32. usque ad Sess. 65.

r Ibid. Sess. 132. p. 1. p. 1

s Ibid. Sess. 128. p. 276.

t t Correp. Corr. p. 57.

Twiss. vin. Gra. l. 2. p. 1 crim.

3. Sect. 1. p. 51.

* loco jam citato

as if *peccatum qua peccatum*, and *adultery* in particular, had been concealments of their opinion. Sixthly, Let them say what it is to be the *Author* of sin, and how many *ways* an Agent is said to be an *Author*, and by how many *expressions* it may be spoken, or made out, and I will parallel it all from some or other of their *writers*.

§ 4. If there were any possibility of excusing the words and expressions of my *Assailant's Party*, why should he make it his last refuge to judge of their words by their *Intentions*, when all that are *Mortals* have thought it fitter, to judge of mens *Intentions* by the signification of their words? *God alone*, (we all grant) is the *searcher of the heart* and the infallible *discerner of mens Intentions*. Yet as my *Correptory Correptor* did make it his ordinary practice, to confute my heart, and report my thoughts, and quarrel with my *Intentions*, when he found my words were true, and candid, and so cross to his ends, as not to be liable in the least to his exceptions; so here my Reverend *Antagonist* on the contrary extreme (which is indeed much the better) will needs be sure that his Brethren intended no more than Austin before them did say. And again, that they intended no more than by multitudes of places of Scripture they were led unto. Suppose it were possible, that he being but a man should know their *Intentions* however different from their words, yet he cannot but remember, that I accused their words, not their *Intentions*. And I judged of their words by what they signified, not by what they did conceal. If we may judge of their *Intentions* by such Interpreters as *Maccovius*, *Piscator*, *Zuinglius*, *Peter Martyr*, and the like, and if such men may be allowed to judge of intentions by words, (such as I have mentioned Chap. 4. §. 6. & 7.) then I have made it appear, that I have hit their intentions too.

§ 5. But let us look a little more nearly into his words [sure we are, — that protestant Divines have intended no more than Austin before them did say, &c.] 1. Protestant Divines is very equivocally spoken. For those that are of the

Seet. 5. Against Himself, and St. Austin.

61

the Remonstrant's opinions are known to be Protestants as well as others, of whom notwithstanding he will not aver, that they intend no more than *Austin* said. 2. The Papists, (as he confesseth of *Baronius*, and must confess of many more) dislike receding from *S. Austin*, as much as any of their kinsmen, the Prebyterians; which proves the not-receding from *Austin* to be not the least character of a Protestant Divine. 3. Hath *Austin* any where said what I cited out of those men? If my Opponent will produce either the same expressions or others equal to them, then will He (not I) be the accuser of *S. Austin*. But as he hath not done it, so I have reasons to believe he is not able. 4. Suppose there had been such profaneness in any part of *Austins* writings, this would only have inferred he was not then Saint *Austin*. Nor would falsehood have been the better for having proceeded out of his mouth. He that shall say the child is damn'd that is not baptized before he dyes, or that hath not received the other Sacrament of *Encharist*, may say he means no more than *Austin* said, but yet he must be taught to mend his meaning and his words too. The truth 'ont is, *Austin* was not only a Learned, but a well-natur'd man; and desired nothing more, than that he might not be followed in any one of his Infirmities. [For neither ought I to deny (they are (u) *Austins* own words) that there are ma- (h) *Neq; enim* my things, as in my very manners, so in my works also, which negare debet may not only without rashness, but very justly and judiciously sicut in ipsis be blamed.] Thus we see that Father had more humility moribus, ita than his Admirers, and took a care not to be able to autho- multa esse in rize their Errors. Nor will I here conceal the publick con- tam multis fession of (w) Mr. Calvin, because confession is one step to que possint Repentance, and to be thought to have repented is the great- iusto iudicio. est Honour in the world. His confession was this, [That of & nulla teme- at any time his works should be reprinted, he would moderate & ritate culpa- ri. Aug. l. 4. de Animâ & ejus origine, ad Vincent. Vi&.

(w) *Hec quoque non gravatim agnosco, si quando iterum recudantur nostra opera, — in quibus effensionis periculum veremur, moderari etiam & mitigare, &c.* Calvin de lib. arb. contra Pighium.

mitigate

mitigate those things, wherein he feared the danger of scandal, or offense.] Indeed these words do help to wipe off the *stains*, which his *unwary Admirers* are wont to fasten upon his *Name*; whil' it instead of contending that he was sorry for his *failings*, and intended to *publish* his *Recantation*, they endeavour to *justify* what he *condemn'd*; and so the *Calvinists* in effect do write the most against *Calvin*. So vast a difference there is, betwixt them that are but the *Followers* of that *Learned* man, and us who are his *real Friends*. Who do not follow him where he *erred*, through thick and thin, but just as far as he *follow'd Truth*, and as far as, we hope, he did intend his *Retractions*.

§ 6. Whereas my *Affailant* is pleas'd to add, that they intended no more than by *multitudes* of places of *Scripture* they were led unto, (referring by figures to many *Texts*, but in words at length not naming *One*,) I have several things in answer to him. First who told him, that they intended no more? or that places of *Scripture* did lead them to the speaking of what they speak? 2. What *Errors* or *Heresies* have there been within *Christendome*, which have not pretended the very same thing, that *multitudes* of *Scripture* did lead them to their assertions? 3. Why did he not compare one of the *frightfullest* speeches which I accused with any one *Text* of *Scripture* by him producible? 4. Let him name for the future one place of *Scripture*, whereby *Zwinglius* was led to say, [That *God* makes a man *Transgressor*, that *Adultery* or *Murder* is the work of *God* the *Author*, *Mover*, and *Impeller*.] what places of *Scripture* led *Smourius*, *Vermilinus*, *Beza*, *Triglandius*, *Musculus*, *Sturmius*, *Piscator*, *Borrbæus* (not to mention the *Doctrines* of *Mr. Calvin*, *Dr. Twisse*, *Mr. Hobs*, and a multitude the "like,) to say that * *God* is the *Author* of evil, whether of "punishment or of sin? that wicked men sin by the force of "Gods will? that *God* effecteth those things that are sins? "that his *Reprobation* is the cause of incurable despair? that "both the *Elect* and the *Reprobates* were ordained to sin "Quatenus Sin: that he is the cause, not only of the actions "but

* Note that the several Quotations of these are already premised ch. 4. Sect. 3.

"but of the very defects and privations? that is, of the ob-
 "liquities, irregularities, and sinfulnesses themselves?
 Thus we see who they are whose Doctrines of *irrespective*
 and *unconditional Reprobation* (not places of *Scripture*) have
 led them to charge God with *sinfull actions, sins, sinfulness*,
metaphysically abstracted, beyond which no *language*, no
tongue can speak; above which no *fancy*, no *wit* can reach
 5. Though the wonder already is very great, yet will it
 still be much greater, if we compare one of the *Texts* by
 which they are said to be led to their *Intentions* of speaking
 thus. The first Text he refers to is, *Gen. 45. 5, 6, 7, 8.* from
 which place it is evident, that God is affirmed by *Joseph* to
 be the *Author of much good*, which his guilty *Brethren* ne-
 ver thought of, but not at all of the *evil* which they thought
 against him. And it will seem to me somewhat more than
 strange, if Dr. Reynolds cannot distinguish betwixt God's
 *permitting or suffering evil to fall out by the *mills* of wicked
 men, which are free to evil, and by which they are said
 (not to be *unavoidably, fatally, or necessarily* wicked, but)
 to be *voluntarily, and wilfully* wicked, I say it is somewhat
 more than strange, if he cannot distinguish betwixt Gods
 permitting that evil, that he might draw good out of it, and
 his being the *Author or Cause* of that *Evill*, upon oc-
 casion of which the good is wrought. Before he had resol-
 ved to give an instance from that Text, he should have com-
 pared it with what went before chap. 37. where because
Jacob loved *Joseph* more than all his *Brethren*, (v. 4.) and
 therefore made him a *finer Coat* (v. 3. they hated *Joseph*, and
 could not speak peaceably unto him (v. 4.) but they did not
 hate him by the *Impulse* of God (as Mr. Calvin) at first spake)
 nor did God urge them or smite their *mindes* (as Dr. T misse.)
 For the *Devil*, and their own *Flesh*, (one or both) did intice,
 and tempt, though they could not force them to hate their
 Brother. Well, *Joseph* dreamed a *Dream*, which was also
 a *Prophecy*, that his *Brethrens* *sheaves* should make obedi-
 ence to his: (v. 6. 7.) which dream was from God, and accord-
 ingly both good, and true. But his brethren hated him the more
 (v. 8.) which greater hatred was from the *Flesh*, and the

* Note here
 the Confession
 of Peter Ver-
 milius himself,
 that almost all
 the Fathers,
 and particu-
 larly Austin
 (which is
 more than al-
 most all) do
 interpret Tra-
 dere ad pec-
 candum by sine-
 re, permissi-
 re deferere.
 Pet. Merl. in
 Rom. 1. p. 78,
 79, 80.

Devil. Joseph, kind to his brethren, as well as obedient to his Father, went to seek out his brethren from the vale of Hebron to Sichem, and thence to Dothan (v. 14, 17.) This was from God. But before he came to them, they conspired against him to slay him (v. 18.) This from the flesh, and the Devil. Reuben said, let us not kill him, shed no blood, and would fain have rid him out of their hands to deliver him again unto his Father (v. 21, 22.) This was from God, the wise and holy disposer, of all that happens, to his Glory. But they plunder'd Joseph of his Coat, and sold his Body to the Ishmaelites, for 20. pieces of silver (v. 23, 28.) This was meerly from the flesh and the Devil, being not hindered, but permitted by the long-suffering God to execute their wills against his own. And this he suffered the rather, that he might order and dispose their wicked Fact of cruelty to their innocent Brother (which was also their Rebellion against the commandment and will of their patient God) to many great and good ends, which never could enter into their thoughts. For by the wise, and holy providence of God, (whose excellency it is to draw good out of evil, not evil out of Good) Joseph was sold by the Midianites into Egypt (v. 36.) and advanced in Potiphar's House. (c. 39. 5.) and by his Interpreting of Dreams (which was a gift from God and not from Satan) he was so advanced from one degree to another, that he was made a Father to King Pharaoh, Lord of his House, and Ruler over his land (ch. 45. 8.) This was Gods doing, but no sin sure for injured Joseph to be advanced. There was a Famine in all lands, over the face of the Earth, (ch. 41. 54, 56.) But that was no sin, Josephs brethren went up to Egypt for a supply (c. 42. & 43.) still no sin. Joseph supplyeth them (c. 45.) which was charitably done, and so without sin. What said Joseph of Gods æconomy, to comfort his brethren when they wept aloud, and were troubled at his presence? (v. 2, 3.) He said no worse things of God, than that he sent him before to preserve (a) life, (and that I hope is no sin) to (b) preserve his brethren a posterity in the Earth, and to save their lives by a great deliverance, who had delivered him up to be destroyed with vassalage. Nor was it his sin to requite them, with
fo

^a Gen. 45. 5

^b Vers. 7.

so much love, for their hatred, with so much good, for their Evil. Ioseph goes on, [it (c) was not you that sent me hither, but God.] For they sent him no whither, but sold him to arrant strangers for nothing but money, and sweet Revenge; neither knowing, nor caring, nor at all considering, what the Buyers would do with him; nay, they had killed him outright, but that Judah put them in mind, there was (d) no profit in his blood, but the sole pleasure of Revenge; whereas if they sold him, there was revenge, and profit too, and so 'tis plain, they did not send him into Egypt. But God did work such a kindness within the hearts of them that bought him, as brought Ioseph into Egypt; I mean not only that place, but pitch of Dignity: so that what God did, was transcendently good; good and wise to admiration, tending to his Glory, and all mens good; to good temporal, and spiritual; to all of that age, and all of this; more particularly to the good of Ioseph, and his Brethren; crowning the former with successes in exchange for his afflictions, as well as leading the latter to a sight and sense of their sins.

§ 7. I have already said more than was due, or needfull, by way of vindication of that passage of Scripture from being apt to lead any into such horrible affirmations, as it was brought to authorize by my Assailant. But I have done it the rather, that the common Reader, by this one, may partly judge of all the rest, which he will find to be Instances of sinful men, whom God by his wise and righteous judgment delivered up to the wickedness of their own Inventions; that is, he did not restrain them having refused and resisted the sufficient workings of his grace, but left them gracelesse to themselves as desperate patients, because they had (e) hated, and despised the means of health and Reformation. To this, and that which I have spoken in my (f) Accompt of Mr. Barlee, and to that which I shall speak in my following Section, I refer my Assailant for an answer to those Texts, to which he doth nakedly refer the Reader, withal I add this promise, that if he will descend to every Text in particular, setting down the words, (and not the figures only,

verse 8.

ch. 37. 26.

e Prov. i. 29,

32.

f The divine

Philan. ch. i.

Se&. 5. p. 23.

24, 25. & ch. 4.

from p. 37. to

the end.

which *not one* Reader of *Ten thousand* will take the pains to examine) and arguing from the *rational Importance* of them, as much to his advantage as he is *able*, I will return him a full, and (God giving health) a *speedy* accompt of his *Indevours*.

§ 8. In the mean time it is observable, how very *willing* and *careful* my Rd. Adversary was, to *decline* the *Question* which was in hand, and to lead the thoughts of his *Readers* to *another thing*. Else *why* should he allege so many *Texts* of Scripture (*not in words, but in figures*) which were so wholly *impertinent* to the subject matter of my charge? I had charged some men (*whose words* I produced without their *names*) as guilty of *charging* God with *all the sins* of the *Reprobates*, for the effecting of his *Decree* of *irrespective* *Reprobation*. Wherein were comprehended (and by those *Authors expressed*) not only *subsequent sins*, to which the *wicked* are given up by *God's Desertion*, and are * called the *punishments* of other *antecedent provoking sins*, but also the very *first sins*, which were committed by *Adam* even in *Paradise*, and by *Lucifer* even in *Heaven*. Now the *Texts* which are referred to by my *Assailant*, in excuse of those *Blasphemies* which I accused, do only shew the *punishment* of *sin* with *sin*, they being spoken of such *sinners*, and of such *subsequent sins*, as those *sinners* were permitted to *fall into*, by the just judgment of *God* upon them, whom they had *provoked* to *forsake* them, and *leave* them to *themselves*, in revenge of their having *forsaken* him *first*, and *rebelled* against him by their *former wickedness*. So that as his *first Text* was no less than *against* his *purpose*, the *rest* which follow are quite *besides* it. And that no poor soul may be *betrayed*, by the *false application* of all those *Scriptures*, to think *reverently* of his *sins*, and *irreverently* of his *God*, I will *denudate* the *falseness* of it by these following *steps*.

*Peccata subsequentia sunt
precedentium
Ponr. Lomb.

First, when *God* is said to *harden mens hearts*, to deliver them up to a *reprobate mind*, to *send* them *strong Delusions* that they shall believe a *lye*, and the like, it is infinitely * far from

*Augustin. ad
simpl. l. 5 c. 2.

from being meant of an efficacious Impulse in God Almighty. God never hardens any mans heart, as the Sun hardens clay by shining on it, but as the Sun hardens wax by not shining on it; by not softning it any longer, and so leaving it to harden it self. And that all those verbs, [to harden, to blind, to deliver up, to send delusions, to deceive, and the like,] are by an ordinary Hebraism only permissive in signification, though active in sound, is placed without all controversy. First, by the verdict of all the

(a) Fathers both of the Eastern and Western Church. Secondly, by the (a) confession of the chief Calvinists themselves, that is the judgement of the Fathers. Thirdly, by (b) Austins judgment in particular, whom our Adversaries prefer before all the rest. Fourthly, by the Adversaries (c) confession, that that is Austins own way of Interpreting such Texts. Fifthly, by the peremptorie assertion of Melancthon, (d) from whom my Adversaries cannot comfortably recede. Sixthly, by the grant of (e) Du-Plessis, that in the usual stile of the Scripture, he who doth "not restrain when he can, is said to give up; he who doth not take away when he can, is said to give; and He who doth not give, is said in that case to take away. God is said to raise out of the Grave, when he only hinders from going thither; and "to lead a man thither, when he only suffers him to fall, "or does not hinder him from falling. The same Seigneur du Plessis doth farther exemplifie his Decirin, not only by that petition, "lead us not into temptation, of which the meaning he saith is this, Do not suffer us to be vanquished by the "Temptations of the World and of the Devil; but by that common Idiotisme of the French tongue, which is as common also in the English. Vous me donnerez la vie, c'est à dire, vous ne la m'osterez point; you shall give me my life, that

(aa) Pet. Marr. Virmil. Florent. in Epist. ad Rom. 1. edit. Basil. 1570.

(b) Indurare nihil aliud est quam nolle emollire; excacare, non illuminare; repellere, non vocare. August. in lib. de prædest. & Gra. cap. 4.

(c) Pet. Mart. loco prædicto. Habet (inquit) hanc interpretationem finendi, & permittendi, Augustinus.

(d) Melancthon in loc. com. de Causa pecc. p. 49.

(e) Dieu est dit ramener du Sepulchre, quand il impesched' y descendre; y mener, quand il y laisse romber, façon de parler commune au Psalmiste, & aux Prophetes, &c. Philippes de Mornay Seig du Plessis Marli. en medir. sur le ver. 4. du ch. 16. des Proverbes.

f Jos. 2. 13.

is to say, you shall not take it from me. So when (f) Rahab did capitulate with the Spies of Iericho, that when they took the City, they should save her life, or permit her to live, the French Translation doth read, *vous me vivifierez, ye shall make me to live.* Now if this figure of speech is admitted to be a figure, where if it were not admitted, it would not be of much moment, how dares any man exclude it from those passages of Scripture, where to exclude it, is to blaspheme? And if the learned Du Plessis doth acknowledge that figure, who is of irrefragable Authority with many Followers of Mr. Calvin, why should any man deny it, at the hazard of making God to be the Author of sin? But seventhly, this matter is farther evident, and that by the preachings of Bishop Andrews, from vvhom his Adversaries in this case, vvill hardly publickly dissent; because they are loth to have it visible to common Readers, that he he vvvas frightened out of Calvinism (vvhich first bespake him) by the horrible Conclusions to vvhich it led, upon those vvords of our Saviour in the Imperative mood, Destroy this Temple, meaning the Temple of his Body, that Holy man hath these vvords.

* Bp. Andrews
Sermon 10. of
the Refur. up-
on Joh. 2. 19.
p. 486, 487.

" * That it should enter into any mans heart, to think,
" that Christ vvould open his mouth to command or to coun-
" sel his own making away, (that is, the committing the
" most horrible foul murder that ever vvvas) God forbid;
" give me any Religion rather than that, that draweth God,
" into the Society of sin; makes him, and makes Christ, either
" Author, or Adviser, Commander, or Counsellor, of ought
" that is Evil. Any (I say) rather than that. First, how
" then? if no command, vvhat is it? all that can be made
" of it (say the antient Fathers) is, but either a prediction
" (in the stile of the Prophets) come down Babel, that is,
" Babel shall be brought down; so solvite, ye shall destroy; to
" vvarn them, vvhat he savv they vvvere novv casting about,
" and vvhither their malice vvould carry them in the end.
" even to be the Destroyers and Murderers of the son of God.
" Secondly, either this; or (at most) but a Permission,
" vvhich in all Tongues is ever made in this mood (in the
" Imperative,) so vve use to say, go to, do and ye will; or
" do

Isa. 47. 1.

Act. 7. 52.

“do what ye will with my *body*, when we mean but *sufferance*, and no *command* at all. This *soluite* was to them, as *Fac ciò* to *Indas* after; *Quod facis*, that which thou art resolved to do, and hast taken earnest upon it, *fac*, do it; *fac ciò* do it John 13. 17. out of the way; which yet (it is well known) was nothing but a *permission*, and not a jot more. 3. But should so foul an evil, as that, be *permitted* though? No, nor that neither, simply; it is not a bare *permission*, but one qualified; and that with two limitations, will ye mark them? For first, he would not suffer any evil at all, (least of all that) but that out of the evil he was able (able and willing both) to draw a far greater good. Greater for good (I say) than, that was, for evil. And that was *soluitionem peccati ex solutione Templi*. 2. But neither was this enough yet: Neither would he for all this, have at any hand let it go down, but that with all he meant to have it up again presently. — The world with us, hath seen a *soluite*, without any *Excitabo*; Down with this, but nothing raised in the stead. But this is none of His. *Soluite*, without *excitabo*, is none of *Christs*. — With these two limitations, under these two conditions; one of a greater good by it; the other, of another as good or better, in lieu of it; may *soluite* be said *permissive*: and otherwise not, by any warrant from *Christ*, or from his Example. 8. This figurative use of the Imperative mood, which is also fitly called the *permissive mood*, may be demonstrated by such *Scriptures*, as cannot be otherwise understood, though not one of those Authors by me alleaged had declared their judgments on this occasion. God said unto *Satan* concerning that (g) perfect and upright man, g Job. 1. 1. 2. (h) All that he hath is in thy power, and (k) behold he is in h ver. 12. thine hand. Our blessed Saviour said unto the Devils, k ch. 2 ver. 6. (l) *Goe*, but he commanded them not to go away into the herd of swine, only gave them *permission*, for which they m ver. 31. (m) petition'd, and yet he said [goe] in the Imperative n ver. 21. mood. But the Devils also petition'd him in the Imperative mood, when they said, (n) suffer us to go, who yet cannot be

o vers. 29.

* vers. 31.

p Job 1. 11. &
ch. 2. v. 5.

q 1 Sa. 12. 17.

r Hof. 13. 11.

r Ibid.

be thought to have commanded him whom they petition'd, and whom they (o) acknowledged the Son of God, who had an ability to Torment them. And the ~~prayer~~ ^{petition} in the confession must bear proportion to the ~~petition~~ ^{petition} in the Petition. For Petitioners they were in that they * besought him however they besought him in the Imperative mood. In the Case of Job, Satan intreated God in the Imperative mood, (p) Put forth thy hand, and Touch all that he hath. Who yet cannot be thought to have commanded his Master, because his Master cannot be thought to have obey'd him. For when God said, behold, he is in thine hand, he clearly spake of a permission: where by the vway it is observable, (and may it be usefully observed by them, vvho take a delight to doe mischief, and seek to justifie their Cruelties by God's permitting them to do vvhat they desire, and possibly pray that they may do it) that vvhen vve beg of God, (as Satan did) that vve may prosper in doing wickedly to any man in the vvorld, as Satan to Job) and vvhen God shall grant our petition (as he did Satans) by permitting us to do, or not-hindring us from doing all the evill vvchich vve desire, vve must conclude that God's grant of such petitions is only an Argument of his wrath, (as it vvvas to Satan, Job 1. 11, 12. Mat. 8. 31, 32.) and not at all of his kindness, or approbation. Israels (q) wickedness was great in asking a King (as Samuel told them,) yet God gave them their own asking, and God himself (r) tells us, that He gave in his anger the thing they ask'd. Having a King, they vvould have none, and God took him away; but the same Text tells us that he did it in his (r) wrath. 'Tvvvas ill to live with a King, in one Case; but 'tvvas worse in an other, to live without him. Novv from these 8 things vvchich I have spoken, and especially from the last, it doth appear to all vvithout Dispute, That vvhen God said to the lying spirit, Go, and prevail, 1 King. 22. 22, 23. (vvchich is one of the chief instances alleged by my Assailant) he said no more than our Saviour said to the Devils Matth. 8. 32. vvchich amounted to no more than a permitting them to do, vvhat they vvould choofe to do, if they vvvere not hindered. God said go, that is, he gave

Sec. 8. To Blasphemous Speeches.

71

gave him *leave or sufferance*, which he expressed in the *Imperative mood*, in which *mood* also *petitions* may be expressed, (as hath been shewed) which are as *opposite to commands* as we can wish them.

But to this my *Assailant* may object his other chief Instance 2 Sam. 16. 10, 11. where *David* saith of cursing *Shimei*, *Let him alone*, for the Lord hath bidden him, which though urged by Mr. Barlee, and sufficiently answered by me(s) already, yet I will add in this place, to what I said in that other; For we who are *fishers of men*, must strive to catch them to the Truth, by several Baits. Thus then I reason within my self; (1) What God doth command us we ought to do, and not to do it, is *ἁνομία* or breach of Law. Thence it was not the mercy, but sin of *Saul*, to save the life of wicked *Agag*. Whom if he had killed, it had not been murder, but obedience. Nor had it been parricide, but sacrifice, if *Abraham* had slain *Isaac* with his hand, as he had done already in the obedient purpose of his Heart; which that *Friend of God* purposed, not by Cruelty, but Faith. Heb 11. 7. Hereupon it followes (2) that if God had bidden *Shimei* to curse *David* in that literal sense wherein we commonly use the word, *Shimei* (like *Nathan* 2 Sam. 12. 7, 8. &c.) had done his Duty. Nay, he had been a Rebel against God, if he had not done like a Rebel against *David*. He had cursed his Sovereign, as *Balaam's Ass* reproved his Rider, and had been every whit as innocent, if God had literally bid him, it being as great a Truth in Ecclesiasticus, as if it had been in Ecclesiastes, *that God hath commanded no man to do wickedly. Here then I ask, did *Shimei* sin, or did he not? If he did sin, God did not literally command him, but permit him only. If he did not sin, nothing is gotten by my *Assailant*, in case he had been commanded. But granting *Shimei* to have sinned, (as indeed he did) and by consequence to have acted, not according to Gods command, but point-blank against it, (for every sin *quā tale*, is the transgression of some precept, 1 Joh. 3. 4.) one of these two things must inevitably follow; either that *David* was in an Error, when he hastily said, [The Lord hath bidden him,] and

s The Divine
Philan Defen.
ch. 4. Sec. 35.
p. 47, 48, 49.

* Eccl. 15. 12

and was betrayed into that error by making reflection upon his sins, especially his being a man of blood (as *Shimei* called him very truly, verse 7, and 8:) or else, that David meant no more, than that God permitted him: if the first is granted, then the error of Davids judgment (which was very fallible) doth put an end to the objection; if the second is granted, (but not the first,) than God was only signified, not to hinder, but to permit that sin of cursing, and so it ceaseth to have the force of an objection; nor is it any the least excuse, much less yet a justification, of those horrible things which I accused in my * Notes; for there it is said by those Writers, whom my Reverend Assailant doth do his utmost to excuse, that God doth (not only permit, but also) command, yea compel. His bare permission of sin is called a fiction, and against it, is set up his will, and Decree, and that Decree is called efficacious, & that will, transient into the sinfull act; nor only his transient will, and efficacious decree, but his Impulse also, and that in particular to Adultery and Murder, of which God is also there said to be the Author. And to vindicate the purity of the Almighty from such aspersions, which are perversely laid upon him by the literal exposition of some Texts which are figuratively expressed by the sacred Penmen. I have, and shall eternally, put the people in minde, to understand such Scriptures according to the figure, which they find to be contrary to the plainest Tenor of other Scriptures, and as contrary to the nature of a good and holy God, so far forth as they are taken according to the letter. For as vvhhen St. Paul saith, the weakness of God, 1 Cor. 1. 18. Yea, and the foolishness of God, 1 Cor. 1. 25. He doth and must mean according to the figure, because the literal meaning is both false and Blasphemous; so vvhhen God is (t) said to have deceived the people or the like, it is and must be meant according to the figure, that he hath suffered, or permitted, or left them to themselves, and to their temptations to be deceived. And as it is a less sin, to say that Saint Paul vvas a weak and a foolish speaker, then that God is capable either of weakness or foolishness; so is it also a lesser sin, to say, that Jeremiah vvas a deceitfull

* p. 9. & 10.

3 Jer. 4. 10.

deceitful prophet, than that God is a Deceiver. which as it prompts me to conjecture what kind of principles they are, by which so many are made *Atheists*, and *Scoffers* at the *Scriptures*, so it puts me in minde of what was said by King James at (u) Falkland, [that taking all things to the strait u A. D. 16. 18. Tenor of the written letter, is the matter of jar betwixt Puritans, and us.] To do it in many other cases, (as in that alleaged out of St. (w) Paul) is unpardonable sottisness, but to take such places according to the letter, which are literally opposite to the purity of God, I want a word whereby to exprels how ill it is, for I must ever say with the Stupendous Bishop Andrews, “ (x) Give me any Religion, (any Exposition, any Exposition.) rather than that, that draweth God into the Society of sin; making him either the Author, or Adviser, Commander, or Counsellor of ought that is evil, “ I say any, rather than That. I have said much more, than I intended, to shew the ill use that hath been made of that congeries of *Scriptures*, referred to by my Assailant in his defence of his party, and having been thus long in my first general step, I will truly indeavour to be the shorter in my second.

1 Cor. 1: 18, 25.

x Bishop Andrews in the place before cited.

Secondly, though all should be granted which my Assailant can desire, touching the *Texts* by him alleaged, (which God forbid I should grant) yet they would not be able to come home to the purpose, (as I said before) because *Pharrah*, and the rest who are said to be hardened by God, *Elies sons*, they who did not like to retain God in their hearts, they who regarded not the love of the truth that they might be saved, *Absolon*, *Judas*, & the like, are no where said in the *Scripture* to have been predestined to those sins which were antecedent to their being hardened; their not hearing the voice of the Father, their being given up to a reprobate minde, and to strong delusions, and to all those sins which they were permitted to commit by the just judgement of God for their former wickedness, wheren he is not, he cannot, he must not be said to have any efficiency, or Approbation. But the writers, whose writings vvere accused by me of *Blasphemy*, do teach, that God did fore ordain, and fore-deter-

x Calvin. In-
stic. l. 3. c.
23. Sect. 6. p.
324. sub si-
nem.
y Idem ib.
Sect. 7. p. 325.
z id ib. Sect.
6. p. 324.

a Non aliâ ra-
tione quæ fu-
tura sunt præ-
videat, nisi
quia ita ut fie-
rent decrevit
b Ideo præsci-
verit, quia de-
creto suo sic or-
dinârat.

min, all the sins in the World, all things, and events, without exception; and that he did not fore-see them any otherwise, than because he fore ordained them. Mr. Calvin is less un-
wary than others are, and yet the same Mr. Calvin who saith in (x) one place, that all things happen by Gods ordination, will and Decree, and not only by his foresight; also saith in an (y) another, that God did therefore foresee them, because by his Decree he had so ordained them; nay, he saith in the same place where he said the former, (and that with commendations bestowed on Valla, for having said it as well as he,) that God (z) foreseeth things future by no other means, or reason, or way, than because he decreed that they should be so done. And to assure us that he placeth the De-
cree of God before the fore-sight, he puts the fore-sight in the (a) Present tense with the Decree in the Preterperfect; and again the fore-sight in the (b) Preterperfect tense with the Decree in the Preterpluperfect. As if he thought that Gods Decree were before his prescience or fore-sight even in order of time, and that the portions of that Creature could have place in Eternity: if he did not think so, he might have sa-
tisfied himself with a [non aliâ ratione, quam] and not have added an [ideo, quia, therefore, because] in the very next Section. But let his ablest Followers construe his words, how they will, or can, they must grant his Doctrin
to be this, That whatsoever comes to pass which God fore-
saw from all Eternity, he did also decree from all Eter-
nity; But it was also his Doctrin, that God foresaw
from Eternity all the sins in the world without excep-
tion; therefore it was his Doctrin, that God did also de-
cree all the sins in the world without Exception. Nor can
they possibly pretend, that all sins are the punishments of
former sins, because then they would incur one of these ab-
surditie either that no sins are the first, or that there are
sins before the first, and so that the first are the second, and
the antecedent the consequent, which would imply an unex-
cusable contradiction. They are awedly of this judgement
that there is a necessity of all events, and that God doth ne-
cessitate the very first obliquity of his creatures, and for that

very

very first doth also damn them, as appears by what they say of the *Damnation of Infants*, which though sufficient of it self, to shew the *false application* of the 38. *Texts*; yet is it not all I am to say of my *Assailant's* misfortune in that *Attempt*. For,

Thirdly, If these places by him alleaged were not *figuratively* spoken, (that is) according to the *Hebraisme* already mentioned, but did *intentionally* import Gods *efficiency of sin* in any kind or any thing else which imports him to *will* it only, then would they be so *contradictory* to all the other places of *Scripture* wherein no figure can be pretended that we should find it *impossible* to reconcile them. For when God in * *Scripture* expresseth his hatred of sin in the highest terms of *Detestation*, and forbids it by a *Law*, and provides against it by *Threats*, as well as by many other means, and clears himself from all aspersions which *Carnal Fancies* have imagin'd to his dishonour; his words are so plain, and their *literal importance* is so rational, that every man as he is man, doth as naturally believe it, as he naturally believes there is a God. And such as have learn'd to *disbelieve* it, have not learn'd that lesson, as they are men, but they have learn'd it so far only as they have learn'd to be *inhuman*. And I appeal to all the world, whether, when two places of *Scripture* do seem to *clash*, and *contradict*, we are not obliged to interpret the hard, by the *easy*, the *equivocal* by the *univocal*; the *harsh*, by the *agreeable*; and that which according to the letter hath *materiam odiosam*, by that, which according to the letter hath *materiam favorabilem*.

It follows from all which I have said, that those 38. *Texts* are nothing at all to the purpose, for which they were alleaged by my *Assailant*, for they amount at the most to no more than this, that God doth * *punish mens sins* by not restraining them from sinning farther; which is expressed in *Scripture* by *giving up*, or *hardning*, or some other word, which (according to the *Hebraism* so often mentioned) is *active only in sound*, but *permissive in signification*. For when God is said to *punish sin with sin*, it is meant *negative*

* Habak. 1. 13.
Psal. 5. 4 &
81. 13.
Psal. 45. 7.
Iam. 1. 13, 14
Ecclef. 7. 29.
Dan. 9. 7.
Ecclef. 15. 12,
13.
Iob 34. 13.
Ezek. 18. 29.
Isa. 5. 3, 4.
Acts 17. 30.
2 Per. 3. 9.
Heb. 7. 26.

* Fatente D.
Hen. Al-
tingio, in Sy-
nod. Dord.
fess 69. p. 237.

* Ezck. 24.
13.

* Rev. 22. 11.
** Rom. I.
26. 28,

* Isa. 63. 17:
Ezek. 20. 25,
26:
Ezek. 24. 21.
Iob 2. 3.
2 Sam 12. 11.
* Icr. 7. 9, 10.
Et ejusdem fa-
rine alii, atque
alii.
* Mat. 2. 22.
which com-
pare with.
Acts 9. 34. &
that again
with Acts 14.
9.
* Acts 14. 16.

tive. As for example, * because God had purged Israel, and Israel was not purged, therefore he would not purge them from their filthiness any more; that is, he would permit them to be filthy still; he would not cleanse them against their wills; and so we see it is explained by God himself, what is meant by his punishing of sin with sin. He that * will be filthy, and is resolved on't, and rejects the means of his purification, is left by God or given * up, or given * over to be filthy still; so that the writers whom I charged with making God the Author or cause of sin, were not led into those mischiefs by multitudes of Texts of holy Scripture, (as my Assailant hath very dogmatically, but very groundlessly pretended, (but rather they led those Texts of Scripture which way they pleased to serve their Turns. The word of God hath been ever used as a Lesbian Rule, by all sorts of Hereticks, who have been first preengaged [δουλευεν υπαβισιν] to be humble servants to their opinion. And when the Scripture is led by them (or rather dragg'd and tortur'd) to the maintaining of those Errors which they espouse, they pretend to say no more than what they are led unto by Scripture. And some of the people are so shallow, so credulous, so unexercised in reasonings or so unwilling to take the pains to consider, and examin what they are taught, as to swallow so dangerous and so thick a Fallacy. But so far is the Scripture from leading any, to say, that God is the Author or Cause of sin, (as some,) much less the Necessitator, and Compellor to it, (as others,) that it even compels us (if we are sober) to say the contrary. There are indeed some * figurative expressions which carnal men have profanely * used; but the figure in those expressions is so visible a figure, that they who cannot indure to see it are fain to wink very hard. There being nothing in Scripture so plain as this, that as the * womans faith is said to have made her whole, not because it did heal her but because without it she had not been healed; so God is said to have done many things, not because he did, or could do them, but because without him they had not been done, for nothing can be, or be done, with his * sufferance.

CHAP. VIII.

E. R.

"For my part I thus Jndge, That if men would
 "candidly carry this Controversie to its Native and
 "proper Issue, it would amount to this. 1. Whether
 the Graces of Faith, Perseverance, and the glory
 "following, be not God's own? 2 Whether being so,
 "he may not do what he will with his own? 3. If so,
 "whether he might not, ab æterno, absolutely purpose
 "in himself, on whom to bestow them, from whom to
 "withold them, without any Injury unto any?

T. P.

§ 1. **N**OW Reader observe, how he displayes his
 strength. He considerably begins to handle
 the matter of main Debate. Some weighty
 thing may here be look't for from one whose
 Parts and Abilities are so acknowledgedly great. He now
 undertakes to state the Question and that by amassing to-
 gether some Propositions, which are not at all to the Que-
 stion in hand, and which being granted will not do him the
 least good office; for it would never be thence conclusible,
 that I have erred in any one period, or that the Corruptory
 Corruptor hath justly charged any the least error on me. He
 doth but grant what I would have him, That Faith as well
 as Perseverance are God's own free Graces, not imputable
 to us before he gives them, (and when he hath so given
 them he calls them ours.) He is farther of my Judgment,
 that

that God might purpose *ab aeterno* without Injury to any, on whom to bestow, and from whom to withhold them. But here it is to be observed, that his *two* or *three* Propositions (if or we may call them either) which he premisseth as the *ground* of his *state*, do clearly belong to nothing else but to the giving or withholding of Grace and Glory, not at all to the *Decreeing eternal Torments* without the consideration of their *Transgressions* on whom those *Torments* are presupposed to be *decree'd*. And this he knows was the *Question* he should have stated, as that to which my *Notes* did more *especially* belong, and which alone had been pertinent to his *Paragraph* going before. But let us see how he proceeds.

E. R.

** Let the Reader compare this with his following Section, which shall be the Theam of my fifth Section of this 8th. chap. for there he speaks of Gods omnipotency in determining the will, and from thence we must fetch his true meaning in this place.

4. *Whether it imply a Contradiction, for God by his power so to determine the will of the Creature, hinc & nunc ad unum, as that it shall retain its own Nature, and yet shall not de facto, fully and victoriously resist Divine Grace, but shall invincibly and most certainly, as to God's Determination, and yet most sweetly and willingly, as to its own manner of working, make choice of that Good, in the choice whereof, it is demonstratively convinced, that its felicity doth stand?*

T. P.

§ 2. **F**IRST it is not our Question, what may be without a Contradiction, but what *is*. Many millions of things may be; which are not; and particularly in this very case, many things I might do, and yet retain my own Nature, which yet I do not. And if I, much more may God

God. But what *Logick* is it to argue, *à potentiâ ad Actum* or what would be thought of that *Disputant*, who should prove that God doth commonly make *New Suns*, and many times create *new worlds*, because it implies not a contradiction for God to do it? This is a visible unhappiness, that from the ability to do, unto the Act of doing, should be the utmost force of this Argument. But 2. Here is the Fallacy called *plurium Interrogationum*, for one Question is, whether it imply a contradiction for God by his * power to determine the will of the Creature *hic & nunc ad unum*, and yet it still retain its own Nature? A Second is, whether it imply a contradiction, for God so to determine it *ad unum*, as that it shall not *de facto* fully and victoriously resist Divine Grace? A Third is, whether it imply a contradiction, for God so to determine, as that it shall *invincibly* and most certainly, as to Gods determination, make choice of that Good, in the choice of which it is demonstratively convinced that its felicity doth consist. These are three distinct Questions not to be stated the same way. And if any, yet at least the two last are not the Questions that are controverted betwixt me, and my Adversary, in case my Adversary is *Christian*, and if he is not a Christian, let him but say the word, and I will dispute with him upon it. But having severed his 3 Questions which he fallaciously conjoyned, (as if they were all three equal in respect of what he demanded) I shall speak to each of them, how little soever I am concern'd. And since his fashion is to ask, I will prepare for my Answer to his first Question, by asking him also this other Question; whether Liberty of will be of the Nature of the Creature, that is. of man here in *via*? If it be said that it is not, I oppose two things; first man's state before the Fall, of whom it is acknowledg'd by my Adversaries themselves, that He then had a Liberty to stand or fall. But fall he did, who had [*à posse non peccare*] sufficient

* Note Reader, that by Power, in this place, he means omnipotent, controuling, necessitating power, as he explains himself in his next Session; where he ranks and illustrates God's working man's will to conversion, with his saying in the creation, omnipotently, Let there be light, and there was light. Whereas had he spoken of such a power as depriveth the will of its Servitude, without depriving it of its Liberty, and by consequence of its Nature, we had been then at agreement. But as it is, I am forced to shew his Failing.

* *Natura, cum potestatem habuerit non delinquendi sponte deliquit; & deceptoris suo propria voluntate se subdidit.* Augustin. ad Artic. falsò sibi Impos. 5. p. 864.
 He doth not say, that men by nature but that nature had a power of abstaining from sin, which had I said, as Austin did, I had been called a Pelagian.

sufficient Grace to have* *not false.* And of him in his Innocence I demand, as of a Creature; Could God by his power determine him *hic & nunc ad unum*, and yet he retain his own Nature and Liberty? could God absolutely decree his eating the fruit that was forbidden, and yet he retain his Liberty not to eat? what would this be,

but to determine, and not determine? and what are they, but the two parts of a Contradiction? But here I suppose my *Assailant* will say, that he is least of all concerned to differ from me, because he is not a *Supralapsarian*. And therefore in the second place I oppose *Man* after his *Fall*, of whom whatever is apprehended of his Liberty to Good, 'tis universally granted that he hath free-will to evil, unless when God doth determine him to the contrary. But (excepting that one Case) He hath a free-will to evil, even then when God gives him to will and to do, and when by *Christ* he doth free him from the slavery of sin. For my *Assailant* will not say, that man is so much advanced upon this Earth above the first state of *Adam*, as to have arrived to [a non posse peccare] an Impeccability, or inability of sinning. Upon which it follows, that the posse peccare, or ability to sin, is of the Nature of *Man* as *Man*. And therefore, for God by his power to determine him *hic & nunc ad Hoc*, scilicet *ad non peccandum*, what is it but contradictory (in that very particular of his being so determin'd) to the retaining of his Nature? for when he is determined *hic & nunc*, to a not sinning, then *hic & nunc*, he cannot sin, because if he can, he is not determin'd, else where were the difference betwixt being determin'd and undetermin'd? but if he cannot sin, so far, as he is determin'd by God not to sin, and if by Nature he can sin, (which is as undeniable) then to be determin'd by God's power, and yet to retain his humane Nature (as to the liberty of his will) must needs imply a contradiction. Now that the most unlearned Reader may not fail to comprehend, how the project of my *Assailant* is plucked up by the Root by what I have spoken unto his first

Sect. 2. *Implies a Contradiction.*

81

first Question, I will desire him to consider, before I go any farther, That I have not *disparaged*, but *vindicated* and *cleared* the *Almightiness* of God, from an implicit *Calumny* which must of necessity be cast upon him, when his *Almightiness* is extended to the *doing* of those Things which do imply a *Contradiction*. The *Infinity* of his power is seen and celebrated in this, that he can do *all things* which are not *evil*, or *unworthy*, or *unbecoming* his *Godhead*. He who out of *Nothing* created *All*, can again (if he please) turn *all* to *Nothing*. But he cannot so make things out of *nothing*, as that they shall be *nothing* still. Nor can he so turn his *Creatures* into *nothing*, as that they shall retain their own *Nature* of *Creatures*. He cannot so *deprive* his *Creatures* of any thing, that they as shall *keep* and *retain* the things of which they are *deprived*; it being *impossible*, (as implying a *Contradiction*) to have what we have not, even whilst we have it not. It was of the *Nature* of that Fire in *Nebuchadnezzars Furnace*, to *scorch* and *burn*, and God by his *omnipotence* did determine that Fire [*illic & tunc ad hoc unum*] not to burn the three Children. But will Doctor Reynolds say, that the Fire at that instant and in that Case, did retain its own *Nature*? and that it had the power to burn them, even whilst it had not the power to burn them? these are the opposite parts of a *Contradiction*, which God cannot *verifie*, because he is of necessity what he is, true, and *Almighty*; which he could not be, if he could *verifie* *Contradictions*. But the most immediate Reason, doth seem to be this, why God cannot *verifie* *Contradictions*; even because they have not a *passive* power of being *verified*. For the *affirming* of the one is the *denial* of the other. And they cannot be both true, because they should not be *contradictions*, if the truth of the one did not make the other false. But this is a thing, which all the world, I suppose, doth unanimously grant. So that as often as we say, God cannot do that which doth imply a *Contradiction*, we do say in effect, He cannot cease to be God; He cannot do evil; He cannot do that, which is therefore *impossible*, because *unworthy* for him to do. He can draw good out of evil by *dispen-*

M

sing

ing of evil to good ends, but he cannot so make evil good as that the evil shall still retain its own Nature. He can destroy his Creature either in part, or in the whole, much more can he alter or change his Creature, but not so as that it shall remain unaltered under that alteration. God can determine the will of man *hic & nunc ad unum*, and so deprive the will of that part of its Nature, but not so as that the will shall continue undeprived, or retain its Nature, of which it is deprived, even whilst it is deprived of it. When God determines a Man to one thing, 'tis certain he cannot do another, for if he can, he can resist, not Gods will only, but his Power. And then to say he retains that very part of his corrupt Nature, his being able to sin, whilst he is determin'd by God's power to a disability of sinning, what doth it but imply a contradiction? I could be heartily sorry to find my Opponent in this method, of raising and supporting the whole Fabrick of his Errors, upon that which is not only the greatest Falshood, but the greatest Impossibility in all the world, but that by giving me opportunity (as well as provocation) to treat with him hereupon, and to shew him the Fallacy or Quick-sand on which he builds, I make no doubt but he hath opened a speedy way to his being undeceived; And that he will resolve, upon a review of his first Question, That when God gives sufficient, yea and effectual Grace, both to will and to do any thing that is good, he doth not alwayes by his power (which is not resistible) determine his Creature *ad hoc unum*, but permits him to retain so much of his own Nature, as the liberty of sinning, of resisting, or of grieving his Spirit comes to, (which Scripture, and Reason, and daily experience doth make apparent.) And that when he doth otherwise, either in some one act here in *via*, or else in all acts in *statu comprehensorum*, by confining and determining the will *ad hoc unum*, he takes away that Liberty or power to sin, which was Natural to the Will before its said determination.

§. 3. This being said thus largely in Answer to his first Question, doth put his second out of all possible dispute. For it being once *supposed* and taken for *granted* by the *Adversary*, that God by his power doth determin the will *ad hoc*; the Creature shall not have the *least* liberty to *resist*, because the Creature is *not stronger* than God. But withal it is as certain, that though God doth only *efficaciously* move the will by his *Grace*, (without interposing his *irresistable* power, by which he *determins* the will *ad hoc*,) yet there are some who, *de facto*, do not *victoriously* resist; and therefore *grace irresistable*, where *efficacious* and *congruous* will serve the turn, is not only a *groundless*, but a *needless Invention*. And if he useth the word [*victoriously*] as if he thought it a disparagement for the *Grace* of God to be so resisted, St. Paul will tell him of a *quenching*, as well as a *grieving*, and *resisting* the Spirit of God. (g) Mr. Baxter also will tell him *Saints Everlast* (whom he will own as a *Brother*) that the *Reprobates* in *Rest. part 3.* "Hell had the means of *escaping* their going thither. And *Sec. 15. c. 2. p.* "that they had not been there, but that they *forsook* God, and *36, 37.* "took pains to be *damned*, resisted *Grace*, * *conquered* the *Spirit*, did * *overcome* the * *Power* of *Mercies*, *Judgement*, the " *Word* it self, did silence *Conscience*, seek diligently for their "own *Perdition*, and would not suffer themselves to be *saved*. He "farther adds, that even they who are in *Hell* had *Heaven* "purchased for them, but they rather made choice to buy the "Flames of *Hell* so dearly, then to have *Heaven* on free cost. Thus we see, there are some *Presbyterians*, who are sufficiently convinced of such opinions and *Doctrins*, which by other *Presbyterians* are called *Arminian*.

§. 4. His third Question, like his second, is without all Question, and that which no Man can be concerned in, for it being *supposed* (as by him it is) that the will of the Creature is *determin'd hic & nunc ad unum*; it will presently follow that it is not *undetermined*; which is the upshot of my *Affailants* inference. And it is as certain, as well as more to the purpose, and better sense, that God is able by his

grace, without interposing his determining power, to work in the Creature a will to good [*faciendo ex nolente volentem*] and when the Creature is *confirmedly* willing, he will then most certainly, in respect of that change which is now wrought in him, and yet most willingly, as to its own manner of working, make choice of that good, &c. So that no kind of strength is in this part of his process, what was before matter of Question, remains so still, *viz.* whither in every Mans conversion God doth determin his will *ad hoc*, so as the Man shall not possibly be able to resist it, and what never was questioned, being granted, is the refusing of a *Chimera*, or the industrious doing of nothing. But what means the addition of these words to the former. [In the choice whereof, it is demonstratively convinced, that its felicity doth stand?] First, we know it is an assent of Faith, and not of knowledge, that our felicity doth stand in the choice of good; and Demonstration is scientificall, produceth knowledge, and assurance; but absolute knowledge and assurance are those perfections of the Saints, by which their Faith and their Hope are done (*h*) away. *Scientia & Fides non possunt esse de eodem secundum idem.* That of which the Saints in Heaven are much too perfect to have a Faith, is that of which the Saints on Earth are too imperfect to have a knowledge. Secondly, False Felicities many times are so far preferred before the true, that he who is strongly persuaded, and believes without doubting, that eternal felicity doth consist in due obedience to the Law of Christ, as directly leading to the joys of Heaven, doth yet frequently pursue his false Felicities on earth, and * *Medea-like*, doth follow the things which he disalloweth. How else comes it to pass, that Men will preach against stealing, whilst they themselves commit Sacrilege? or commend the suffering and receiving of wrong, whilst they (*l*) do wrong and defraud, and that their Brethren? Now upon all this it follows, that nothing is gotten by my Assailant towards his proof of the Certainty and Invincibleness of making that choice, from the Mans being convinced that his felicity consisteth in it. I might here examine, what he means by the word [*Invincibly*] and exagitate

b 1 Cor. 13. 9,
9, 10, 12.
2 Cor. 3. 18.

* *Vide meliora
ra probogue.
Deteriora sequor.* —
k Rom. 2. 21,
22.
l 1 Cor. 6. 8.

gitate his use of the word [*choise*] whilst he is speaking of a will which he supposeth to be determin'd *hic & nunc ad unum*. But I will not insist upon each Infirmary which I espy. It is enough that I observe them, and can then speak of them at large, when he shall attempt me by his Reply. Having observed the laying of his Grounds, I will now consider what he is pleased to lay on them.

E. R.

If this imply not a contradiction, (as I believe it will
 "be difficult for him to prove, who shall undertake it,
 "for why may not God determine the will, as easily as
 "the will can determine it self?) then sure I am, that
 "that * Omnipotency which could say, let there be light, * Compare
 "and there was light, can say, let there be a will unto these words of
 "conversion, and there shall be such a will; That Omni- Dr. Reynolds
 "potency wch could give a Creature a Being out of no- with what he
 "thing, can by an Invincible perswasſo or traction (the said in his Se-
 "radical indifferency of the will remaining still the sion going be-
 "same) suspend the actual prevalent reluctancy therof, fore, which
 " & work it determinately unto such an action, as is ra- was the
 "tionally most convenient & behoofeful for a rational Theam of my
 "Appetite, as the will is, viz. to choose its own Blessed second Section
 "ness: for that is it which every Convert in his effe- of this Chapter
 "ctual vocation, by the power of Grace really doth.

T. P.

§. 5. **I**N this short passage there are two of his strong Ar-
 guments. One in the Parenthesis, and another out of
 it, I will hasten to try the force of both. First he saith
 in the Parenthesis, that 'twill be difficult to prove that that im-
 plies

Plyes a contradiction which was the subject of his first *Question*. To which I answer three things. 1. That which is but *difficult* may yet be *done*; and therefore it doth not *advantage*, but rather *prejudice* his *Cause*, for *seeming* difficult to *him*, unless he could have made it seem more then difficult to *me* also. I fear not that which my *Assailants* call *difficult*, so long as I am not to *encounter* with *Impossibilities*. For if they are *difficult* indeed, it is but *studying* the *harder* to *overcome* them, and if they be but called *Difficult*, (as certainly *this* is) they are then too *weak* for any *elaborate* *Resistance*. But 2. What is *difficult* to one Man, is many times *easy* to another, and though I am but a (*m*) *Novitius* in these *controversies*, (as old Mr. *Whitfield* did very *valiantly* call me, when he gave an example to Mr. *Barlee* in what kind of *Logick* he was to deal) yet I have proved that to be *easy*, which is here believed to be *difficult*. For thirdly, I have shewed, (and I hope with perspicuity,) that to be determined by Gods power *ad bonum* hoc, doth *imply* and *infer* a *disability* to *sin*, in respect of *this* good to which the *will* is determined; and this doth *grossly* *contradict* the *will* retaining [in hoc] that *liberty* of *Nature*, which doth *confessedly* consist in its *ability* to *sin*; and cannot possibly be denied in this state of *Imperfection*, unless it be by the *Ranters*, who corrupt themselves with the opinion that there is *equal* *Necessity* of all *Events*, as equally *issuing* from Gods *absolute* *Decree*. My *Assailant* speaks of Gods *Omnipotency*, which could and did say, *let there be light*, &c. to shew what he means by Gods power *determining* the *will*, which is in effect by making it *no will*, and then to call it a *will* is a *contradiction*. But for this I refer to what I have spoken for much at large in my *second* *Section* of this *Chapter*. I proceed to the reason which he *alleged* [why may not God *determin* the *will*, as well as the *will* *determin* it self?] to which I answer, that he *may* when he *pleaseth*; but what of that? Doth it follow that he *doth*, because he *can*? God *may*, if he *will*, create more *worlds*; and I will ask my *Assailant* [why may he not?] But I will not argue from thence, that he therefore *doth*, because he *may*; yet let it be granted that he

m Mr. Whit-
fields observa-
tion before the
Correp. Corre-
tion.

he doth too (as well in earth sometimes, as in Heaven alwayes,) that will be found to be *gratis dictum*, and will not bring the least advantage unto my Adversaries pretensions. For the Question is not, whether or no he may, or doth, but whether when he doth determine the will *hic & nunc*, to this one good, he doth leave it in that act unto the liberty of its own Nature, that is, *hic & nunc* free to evil. This (I call him to witnesse) is the very Question to be resumed, if he desires not to pass over *ab Hypothesi ad Thesis*, and of this he speaks not a word. But this is the point to which our Attentions are to be held, whilst I give his Question in the Parenthesis (or his second Argument proposed by way of Question) a full and satisfactory Answer. For first it is evident, that mans determining his own will is very reconcilable with the retaining of its Nature; for 'tis an act of his liberty to choose the object of his option, and by actually choosing to determine his will, which as soon as he hath chosen, then as to that which he hath chosen he is not free; for freedom supposeth him yet to choose; and when he hath determined his will *ad hoc*, he cannot in *sensu composito*, not have determined it, although in *sensu diviso* he could have not done it, before 'twas done. Thus we see in reason how Man may do it, and in every-dayes experience we find how he doth. But (secondly) when God determines him by his power, irresistibly *ad hoc*, that is no more reconcilable with the leaving of him free or undetermined, then the Mans having actually determined himself is reconcilable with the leaving himself free. He can no more do otherwise when Gods power hath determined him, then he can have chosen otherwise when he hath actually determined his will *ad hoc*. Behold this, Reader, in one example, or Illustration. A weak Man by his choice may move himself from one place to another; and a stronger Man than he is, may by his power do the same. He that moveth himself by choice doth not impeach his own liberty, because he chooseth to do it freely. But if the other Man move him by his greater strength and power to do it, he is so far forth the strong Mans Prisoner, and so receiveth some impeachment to his liberty, though he may possibly be

pleased

*pleased with his confinement, as being tyed up in Golden bands. This I say not to argue, but to illustrate my former meaning, that the slowest Reader may apprehend it with greater ease, and expedition. Again, A Man determining himself to any one of two competitors, is thereby cleared to be free to choose the one, and refuse the other; and till he hath chosen one, doth not determin that freedom, which by actual choosing (we know) he doth. But when God by his power doth determin the will of Man to this or that very object, there is no resisting that power, and so no freedom to the Contrary. So far is the will from retaining any imaginable indifferency, as to that very Case of which we speak, though my Assailant is so * forgetful as to drop such words.*

* Note, That Dr. Reyn. doth acknowledge the radical indifferency of the will, its being a rational appetite; and its making choice of Good. And all his party do grant free-will. Yet in his printed Sermon on Psalm 122:6, 7, 8, 9 p. 31. He saith, that those Doctrines which affirm free will have a secret aspect and Tendency to Rome.

§. 6. Having shewed thus far, that this implies a contradiction, which he saith doth not, and withall uncovered his reason why, it is not needful to examine what he is pleased to conclude, upon his Hopes that it implies not a contradiction. I may well be allowed not to value the conclusion, when I have so largely disprov'd the premises. And yet, to shew what the Importance of a strong argument is, he concludes no more from what I have disproved, than that when all comes to all he is fain to subscribe to my Opinion; viz. [That God may by the power of his Grace, suspend the actual prevalent reluctancy of the will, and work it determinately to such an action, as is rationally most behoofeful for the will.] This is the opinion of all the world who do believe there is a God, and that he is Almighty, and may do what he will. This was my affirmation in my return to the third of his plures Interrogationes. Nor was it ever a Question betwixt any two Men, much less vv as it ours [whether God may by his power do what he pleaseth?] So that here is plainly Ignoratio Elenchi once more committed. I say therefore again, That God may by his power (if he please) determine

mine any mans Will unto *Conversion*, so as I shall not only infallibly, but also of necessity and irresistibly be converted. But the Question is, whether what he can do he always doth, whensoever he gives sufficient grace; and whether multitudes of men do not resist that Grace, which was on God's part sufficiently and sincerely by him intended for their *Conversion*. Here I professedly maintain that man hath a power to resist that Grace, which was sufficient in it self, and designed by God to work upon him for conversion. But in this I desire that none will purposely mistake me; for in saying what I have said, I do not either explicitly or implicitly deny, that God may (if he will) interpose his power, & actually and infallibly, & irresistibly convert him. Yet I find no Ground or Cause of thinking, that God ever did, or ever will thus convert any one single Person; and therefore I must not only think it, but proclaim it most unsafe and most unchristian to teach men to depend upon this work of his absolute power, and thereupon let slip those blessed and gracious opportunities which by the grace of God may be embraced and made use of, and may cost us dear, if they are not. For as God may do what he will with his own, and therefore give, when he will, irresistible Grace, or Grace (not irresistibly but yet) infallibly converting, and whensoever he doth so, no man hath reason to complain of his superlative mercy; so it must also be granted by my Assailant, that God may also, if he will, proceed no farther with his Creature, then to give them sufficient Grace, to every man a Talent to negotiate with, and to him more Talents who useth that Talent as he ought, and from him who useth it not, or casts it away, or refuseth to receive it, or most unprofitably layes it up in a Napkin, God may justly take away his Talent of Grace which he hath given, or withhold what he had offer'd and was refused; my very Adversaries must grant, that thus God may most justly do, & not interpose his irresistible power to determin the will of man, to make use of his Grace, or to convert him infallibly without those steps. So that if matters in dispute were to be carried by several *Wayes*, I have gained what is sufficient by my opponents endeavours to make me loose.

N

§. 7. But

* Matth. 25.

n Verf. 15.

16, 17.

18.

19.

29.

§ 7. But I have very much more than a naked *May-Be* in the behalf of my Cause, although my *Assailant* hath no more for his, (nor doth so much as pretend to any more than a *may be*.) And He himself in time will clearly see it, if he will duly consider the famous* *Parable of the Talents* wherein this matter is clearly handled, as well as the *Ninth* to the *Romans*, where it is not clear, and where the context doth manifest, that the Apostle there speaks of another thing. (n) *Talents* are there given to every man according to his several Ability (Mat. 25. 15. some improved their *Talents*, (v. 16, 17.) But an idle servant hid his *Talent* in the *Earth*, (v. 18.) They were all called to a reckoning (v. 19.) And the conclusion is express, that unto every one that hath, (that is, maketh use of the *Talent* of *Grace*, which was freely given him to trade withall, which cannot belong unto the acts of *Gods* power determining the will *hic & nunc ad unum*) to him more shall be given, and He shall have abundance: but from him who doth not thus husband his *Talent*, shall be taken away even that which he hath. He shall no longer have what he abuseth (v. 29.) From which way of dispensation, we learn what is, not only *may be*, nay what certainly must be when God hath absolutely decreed that so it shall be; not only what might be (abstracted from God's Decree of the contrary) without implying a contradiction. There are several Courses and *æconomies* which to God are all possible; but here our Saviour doth teach us, which of all those courses God is pleased to choose in his proceedings and dealings with us. All that my Adversary alledgeth amounts only to this, that it is barely possible, or that it implies not a contradiction, for God's power to interpose in the conversion of a sinner (meaning his absolutes determining, irresistible power,) but hitherto he pretends not that thus it is, that God hath bound himself to this constant method, or indeed that he ever useth it at all. Whereas I have shewed on the other side, both that the other method is possible. and, farther, that God is pleas'd to use it; and hath chosen to make it a principal part of the message, for which his Son was sent unto

unto the world, even to *publish* that *method*, that men might know it, comply with it, depend upon it, and not deceive and destroy themselves by giddily fancying any other. And for this I have produced a very evident passage of Scripture, and shall produce many more as occasion serves. I will not run out into greater length by insisting on his acknowledgment of a natural indifferency in the will of man (for which I had *Correptory Correction* though I never spake of it.) Nor will I prosecute his use of the word *Invincible*, by asking whether he means *irresistible*, or not, of which (o) *Paras* did seem to be ashamed, in those papers which he sent unto the Synod at Dort, when he was threescore and ten years old. I will only leave one thing to my opponents consideration, to be compared by him with the present manner of his reasoning. God may give us the ability to fast, without eating, as many dayes and nights, as Moses, or Elias. He may also, if he is pleased, make our *virtualls* to encrease in the very eating, by such a power as he shew'd in the Widow's Cruse (1 King. 17. 14, 16.) He may feed us and cloath us, like the Birds and the Lillies, by the same omnipotency by which he said, *Let there be light and there was light*. He may convert us, as he did Paul, with equal power and expedition; or as the Thief upon the Cross when we have only time left to cry *peccavi*, to think a good thought, and to make a short Ejaculation, (though that either of these two was irresistibly converted, we have no reason to imagine) For God to do those greater things doth not imply a contradiction, and therefore he may do them by that omnipotency, which could give the Creature a Being out of Nothing. but what of this? We cannot prove from hence, that these are the Courses which God doth ordinarily use, or that he useth them once in a thousand yeares; and if we should thus argue, we should but teach men to tempt their Maker, and to ruine themselves by their Security. It will be much more profitable to admonish the Reader in this place (I speak of the unlearned and unconsidering Reader) of the several wayes of Gods working with his several Creatures in proportion to the Natures which he hath given

o Act. Synod.
Dord. part. 1.
Sess. 98. p.
236. & Sess.
99. p. 256.

them. He worketh one way with *Natural Agents*, (as we proverbially call the *irrational Creatures*) but with *voluntary Agents* he useth another way of working. We have an example of the former in that *necessitating Omnipotence*, whereby he sayd unto the *Sun*, *stand still in Gibeon*; we have examples of the latter, in those *compassionate wishings* revealed to us in his word, (q) *O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me and keep all my Commandments alwaies, that it might be well with them, and with their Children for ever!* (r) *O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end!* These, and all other ways, whereby God works upon the wills of Men, are such as are *congruous* and *agreeable* to the nature of a *will*, or *rational Appetite*; as by enlightning the Understanding, and by *perswading* the will, and by *inclining* the affections, by strengthening the hopes, and the fears of the *voluntary Agent*, by the proposing of *promises*, and denouncing of *Threats*, by *Exhortations*, and *Dehortations*, and all other such means as are *congruous* to the nature of *rational Creatures*; and for that very reason they cannot be *irresistible*, like those *other operations* whereby God doth *necessitate* his *natural Agents*. The whole may easily be discerned by all that shall *read and consider*, Jer. 5. 22. 23. Where God (s) complains of his *Israel* for not *fearing Him*; and for not *trembling at his presence*, who had placed the sand for the *Bound of the Sea* by a *perpetual decree* that it cannot pass it. To which *absolute will* of the *Omnipotent*, the *Sea* is *obedient of necessity*; but this *People* (sayd God) hath a (t) *revolving and a rebellious heart, they are revolted and gone*. Which passage of Scripture doth plainly teach us, that the consideration of that *power* which God had shewed in his *ruling the Sea*, was sufficient to move his *People Israel* to *fear and tremble at his presence*; but it teacheth us also as plainly, that it is not the same way of working by which he *ruleth the Sea*, and by which he *ruleth the wills of Men*. He *ruleth the Sea as the Sea*, but *Men as Men*, and the wills of Men as the wills of Men. It was therefore a *strange Adventure* in my *Reverend Assailant*, to infer and argue

SECT. 7. *God's way of working on the will.*

93

argue from *Gods Omnipotency*, that he doth those things which are *incongruous* both to the *Nature* of his *Creature*, and to the *rules* of his *working*, which it pleased his *Wisdom* to set *himself*. And having said thus much by way of admonition to the more unskilful, unwary Reader : I now proceed from the fourth *Question* of my *Assailant* (which consisting fallaciouſly of *three*, hath occasioned this *length*,) unto the fifth general *Question* by him proposed.

CHAP. IX.

E. R.

Whether the Lord hath not been pleased so to reveal
“ *in the Scripture the doctrine of his Decrees touching*
“ *his purpose, of glorifying himself in a way of mercy*
“ *and justice, as that there shall be an* *Exord.* *for*
“ *the Creature to stop at and to adore, that he will not*
“ *have his counsels fathomable by the shallow line of*
“ *humane reason, but when he doth with his Creature*
“ *as the Potter with his Clay, of the same common and*
“ *equal Lump, choose one part unto honour, and leave*
“ *another unto dishonour, his purpose be not, that we*
“ *should acknowledge and adore his Sovereignty, and*
“ *lay our hands on our mouth, as amazed at the un-*
“ *searchableness of his Judgements ? now certainly in*
“ *all this there is no blasphemy. God doth permit sin,*
“ *and what ever he doth, he doth by the counsel of his*
“ *own will, therefore he did ab æterno decree to*
“ *permit it. For otherwise he could by confirming grace*
“ *have hindred and prevented the committing of it,*
“ *as well in all Angels, as in some ; as well in Adam,*
as

"as in Angels, and that without any violence offered
 "to their nature at all. Gen. 20. 5. Gen. 31. 7.
 "1 Cor. 10. 13. Neither can there be given any
 "Cause out of God himself, and the Councel of his
 "own will, leading and inducing him rather to per-
 "mit then hinder it. He did decree to permit it in
 "order to his own Glory, which is the supreme end,
 "and therefore by him absolutely willed, because the
 "being thereof by his unsearchable wisdom and
 "power was ordainable thereunto, He may out of
 "that common & equal Mass, wherein he did decree
 "to permit it, decree in some in whom he did per-
 "mit it, to pardon it, and on them to shew free mer-
 "cy, in others to punish it, and in them to shew due
 "and deserved justice; the one having nothing to
 "boast of, because the Grace which saves them, was
 "God's, the other nothing to complain of, because
 "the sin which ruins them is their own. He may by
 "his huge discrimination of persons, who were in
 "their lump and mass equal, and in themselves in-
 "discriminated, shew the absolute sovereignty which
 "he hath over them, as the Potter over his clay. He
 "may by his most sweet, and yet most powerful effi-
 "cacy, work the graces of faith, repentance, new
 "obedience and perseverance in the wills and hearts
 "of those, on whom he will shew mercy, giving them
 "efficaciously both to will and to do of his own good
 "pleasure, and leave others to their own Pride, and
 "stubbornness, his Grace being his own to do what
 "he will withall. And I say once again, in all this
 "there is neither modest nor immodest blasphemy.

T.P.

T. P.

§ 1. **T**O what he saith in the beginning of this long Question concerning God's *Councils* being *secret* and *unfathomable*, I have these things to return him. First, That the *Secrets* which is once mention'd *Rom. II. 33.* doth not belong to this matter of election of persons absolute, or conditional; but to the depth of God's goodnesse, in patiently bearing the contumacy, both of the Gentiles, and of the Jewes; to the depth of his wisdom, in making the desertion of the Jewes a means of calling in the Gentiles; to the depth of his knowledge, which found a way to work upon the obstinate Jews, by those Jews very Envy and Emulation towards the Gentiles, &c. He would have found that these things had been alluded to in the *Text*, had he compared it with the *Context*, or consulted the *Paraphrase* of the most Reverend Doctor Hammond; whose Volume of *Annotations* if he doth not admire and profit by, it is only because he doth not read them. Besides, it is to be wondred, how he could be so unmindful of the words immediately going before, [*God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all, v. 32.*] and In consideration of that rich mercy, the Apostle cries out [*O the Depth, &c. v. 33.*] So that the purpose is very different for which the *Secrets* is used by S. Paul, and Dr. Reynolds. S. Paul alledging, that God may have mercy upon all, and D. Reynolds the contrary, that God may not have mercy upon upon all. But 2. If the *Secrets* in the Apostle did belong to that business for which he brings it, why doth he himself search into those very mysteries, which he confesseth to be *insearchable*? God's secret purposes were not secret, much less *insearchable*, if a Mortal (such as my Assailant) could finde it out: If I may not affirm that

that Gods decrees are conditional, and respectiue of mens being either in Christ by Faith, or out of Christ by infidelity; then my Assailant may not affirm that Gods Decrees are unconditional, and without respect of mens being, or not being in Christ. For if insearchable to me, it is insearchable to him, and if revealed in the Scriptures, it is not revealed to him alone. Nay, thirdly, rather less, then more, to the men of his * party, who deny the Scriptures to be the revealed will of God, and say it is but called the will of God, and that improperly too, wherby they virtually confesse, that they know nothing of the will of God; but only what men * ought or ought not to do, which they so distinguish from the signification of Gods will, as to say, that what men ought to do is often contrary to the will of God; and what they ought not to do is many times according to Gods own will. This is such strange dogmatizing, that the Reader will be in danger to think I charge them falsely, if I do not carefully refer him to what I (p) have cited and proved against the Corruptory Corruptor. If my Reverend Assailant will endeavour to disclaim or disprove what I have urged, I am able, and ready, to make good my Accusation; but I have really a better opinion of him, then to believe he will vindicate those ugly Doctrines. Fourthly, what ever is secret in the point of Election, wherein God may do what he will with his own, yet he hath clearly revealed himself in his word, as to the point of Reprobation or damnation or preterition (as they call it.) As for Reprobation or damnation, he hath sufficiently revealed, that he will never deal with man by rules of meer sovereignty, but of righteousness and Justice; such as man himself is permitted to judge of, and is * appealed to by God, whether or no it is not thus. Then for the later, viz. Preterition, God hath revealed himself as plainly, that the Son shall (q) not die for the iniquity of the Father; and that with the precious blood of Christ, he hath (r) bought every one who was lost in Adam. And not to insist in this place on the universality of Christs death with his sincere Intentions of extending the benefit of it to all who were included in Adams Loyn, which doth utterly overthrow the dream

* Dr. Twisse
Vind. Gra. l. 1.
part. 1. Digr.
10. c. 1. Sect.
12 p. 140.

p The Divine
Phil. Defend.
ch. 4. p. 57, 58.
59 compared
with the Cor-
rupt copy of
Notes p. 10.

* Isa. 5. 3, 4.
Jer. 2. 5, 11, 12,
13, 14. &c.
Ila. 43. 26.
Mich. 6. 1, 2, 3.
Ezek. 18. 23,
29, 30.
Gen. 18. 23, 25
q Ezek. 18.
r 2 Pet. 2. 1.
2 Cor. 5. 14.
2 John 1. 2.
Rom. 5. 15. to
21.

Se^ct. 2. D. Reyn. betrayeth his whole Cause. 97

dream of *absolute preterition*, I refer to what I have spoken in my (f) defence of Gods *Philanthropie*. Chap. 1. § 2. p. 4, 5, 6. besides the other places pointed out in the (f) *Margin*. That which is added by my *Assailant* concerning the (f) Chap. 1. *Se^ct.* Potter and his clay, doth prove nothing in the world, but 5. p. 21, 22, 23. & ch. 3: that he *misunderstands* the ninth Chapter to the *Romans*; *Se^ct.* 23. p. 85. for the better interpreting of which I refer him to *Castel* to p. 97. & ch. 4. *Se^ct.* 26. p. *Annotati. ns.* Or if either of those three takes him not off 28, 26. from the ordinary *Presbyterian* mistake, I shall be ready to deal with him when he shall think it fit to be the *Apple of Contention*.

§ 2. What he saith of Gods permitting sin, and his decreeing to permit it is only siding with my *Doctrin*e, and saying the same which I said (t) before him; and so against me, neither strong nor weak argument can be deducible from thence; but against himself and his party in two respects for first his party are wont to say, that God doth tempt men unto sin (as Mr. Barlee) that he makes men Transgressors, (as Zuinglius that men do sin by Gods Impulse (as Mr. Calvin) that the will of God doth pass into the sin which is permitted as Dr. Twisse,) that God ordains men to sin quatenus sin (as Maccovius and Smontius,) that he is the Cause of sin (as Piscator) the Author of sin (as Borrhams,) and six hundred things of this kinde which I will not weary my Reader with. All which though my *Assailant* hath done his endeavour to excuse in the former part of his Preface, yet here he tacitly condemns them all, and very orthodoxly casts Anchor at Gods permission. Secondly, whilst he proves that God decreed ab aeterno to permit it, from his actual permitting it in time, he justifies me, and condemns the *Corruptory Corruptor* as well as Mr. Whitfield, in as high a manner as can be wish't, for when I argued in my Notes from the executions of Gods decrees, as from the very best Topick whereby to demonstrate à posteriori the nature of the Decrees. of which they were the executions, the *Vetulus Novitius* in these controversies (to use his own words) being

Correct Copie of Notes, ch. 1. Se^ct. 12. p. 15, 19.

not able to *distinguish* betwixt my *Topick*, and my *Argument*, supposed that *I had not distinguished* betwixt Gods Decree, and the execution of it, and thence complained from the *Press*, that *I had jumbled these both together*, and thereupon Mr. B. gave me his *Correptorie Correction*; as if I were to be *punished* for their defects of *Apprehension*. But my *Rd. Antagonist*, who is exceedingly above those two *Adventurers*, doth here well argue from the execution to the decree, Thus, [*God doth permit sin, and what ever he doth, he doth by the Councel of his own will, therefore he did ab aeterno decree to permit it.*] Now if this way of arguing is *sound and rational*, (as certainly it is, and may be *demonstrated* to be) then my *Reverend Antagonist* must cease to be my *Antagonist*, from this time forwards, upon his own ground. And this I hope to *evince* by the following *chain of propositions*, whereof the one will be firmly *link't* within the other.

1. What God hath *willed* shall come to *pass*, shall come to *pass* as he hath *will'd* it, and no otherwise than as he he hath *will'd* it, (for his *will* of the *circumstance* is as truly *His*, as his *will* of the *substance*
from whence it follow's, That
2. What doth come to *pass absolutely* (as the *Creation* of the *world*, the *mutability* of *man*, the tending of *heavy bodies downwards*, and the like) he did *eternally will* should come to *pass absolutely*, and what doth come to *pass conditionally* he did *eternally will* should *conditionally* come to *pass*.
But all men confels and *God's word* tells us that
3. *Man's eternal Reward* or *punishment* doth come to *pass* upon *condition* of his *obedience*, or by *reason* of his *Rebellion*.

Therefore

4. *Man's eternal reward* or *punishment* were *eternally willed* or *decreed* to come to *pass* in the very same manner in which they do come to *pass*, to wit, on *condition* or in *respect* of his *obedience*, or *Rebellion*.

If

If he will now assent to these *propositions*, we shall for ever shake hands, but if he thinks there is a *fallacy* or *falsehood* in them, I am desirous to know *wherein*: nay, I do humbly *exact* it as a *deed of charity*, that he will *communicate* his *discoveries*, and shew where my *Fallacies* (if I have any) do lie *concealed*. I thus explain my *propositions*, Gods decrees are adequate to their *events*, and the effects of his decrees are exactly *answerable* to his decrees (as *Face answers Face* when a man *looketh* into a *glass*.) For *whatsoever* and *howsoever* he decreed to do *before time*, that *thing* and in that *manner* he doth in *time*. Again, (a) *whatsoever* and *howsoever* he doth in *time*, that *thing* and in that *manner* he decreed to do *before time*; (b) but God in *time* doth cast men into *Hell* in regard of *all their sins* as well *actual* as *original*. (c) Therefore he did *decree, before time*, to cast men into *Hell* in regard of *all their sins* as well *actual* as *original*. These three last *propositions* are a plain and perfect *Categorical Syllogism*. To which I hope I shall receive either a *generous Concession*, or a *perspicuous answer*. And to prevent all *cavils* which may arise from the distinction of *Reprobation positive*, and *negative*, or *Preterition* and *Damnation*, I think it fit to give notice, that in stead of [cast into *Hell*] I might have said as *well*, and as *truly*, and as *convincingly* to my *purpose*, [*reject*, or *reprobate*, or *forsake*,] *ses*. for none will deny, that God doth *reject*, and leave men, and cast them off, for their personal *Infidelities*, *Apostacies*, *Rebellions*, *Murders*, or whatever *abominations* they do *actually* commit without *repentance* and *change of life*; and what he doth do in *time*, he decreed that he would do from all *Eternity*, which is just as much, as I desire to have granted.

a The Major is granted by my opponent, and confirmed from Eph. 1.11.
b The minor is granted by all sides, and is confirmed from all the Scriptures, as Rom. 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
c The conclusion is granted in the premises.

§ 3. Should I now give *strength* to my *Assailant's* main *Argument* to which himself hath given *None*, by *supposing* or *granting*, that God might justly have *reprobated* his *Creatures* meerly as lying in *Massâ*, or *Adams Loyns*, by not affording them an interest in the *Death of Christ*, without any respect to *actual sins*, yet this would do him no

more service then if it were not granted him at all. Because when *Christ* is given for all that *Masse*, (as hath been proved in the first Section of this Chapter,) It is impossible that God should frustrate and null the end of *Christ's* deaths by punishing any man eternally, under this second covenant of grace, meerly for the sin of *Adam*, without incurring that punishment by his rejection of *Christ*, or by actually sinning some other way. I have the charity to hope, that my *Assailant* retains not that unreasonable opinion of God's casting into Hell those new born babes, whose souls he will acknowledge to be much whiter than his own. And yet his opinion of preterition, as an Act of meer sovereignty; and a respecting of persons, (which God * disclaims) doth naturally lead to the opinion of the Damnation of Infants; so as I wonder how any man can detest the one, and at the very same Instant embrace the other. Now though God doth disclaim that wicked proverb, of the childrens teeth being set on edge, (d) upon the Fathers eating sour Grapes, though God doth (e) swear that he wills not the death of a sinner, (much less of the babe which never actually sinned) though he declares himself to have a (f) willingness that all men should be saved, (who are as willing as he is & do not stand in their own light,) though there is no ground in Scripture for such an absolute preterition for which my adversary alleageth his three remarkable Maybes, yet I never did say that there is Blasphemy in them. The propositions which I charged with so much guilt, were of a blacker complexion. Here then the Reader may observe, a very strange Tergiversation in my *Assailant*; who wilfully lies under the blemish of Ignoratio Elenchi, rather then he will manage his undertaking. He undertook to prove it to be no blasphemy, "to say that men do sin by the Impulse of God, that God doth make men Transgressors, and that Aultery is "the work of God the Author, mover and Impeller, and the like: in stead of which he here saith, that God doth permit sin, and may do what he will with his own gifts, and is insearchable in his Counsels, and the like; and when to these things he hath added three may be's, he concludes

* Rom. 2. 11.

d Ezek. 18. 2.

e Ezek. 33. 14.

f 1 Tim. 2. 4.

2 Pet. 2. 9. & c.



concludes that *in all this, there is no blasphemy*. So that here his *Fancy* is his opponent, and he only fighteth, as one that (2) beateth the Air. Yet there is one period in this paragraph, wherein if his meaning is, as his words do seem to import, I am unwilling to say how ill it is. His words ^{g us d'ica st-} are these [*He did decree to permit* * *it in order to his own* ^{26.} *glory, which is the supreme end, and therefore by him absolutely willed, because the being thereof by his unsearchable wisdom and power was ordainable thereunto.*] if these words are sense, and proper English, without a parenthesis, or an hyperbaton, then the word [*Thereof*] must needs relate to *Sin*, which was said truly to be permitted, and not to *Gods glory*; because 'tis nonsense to say, That the Being of his glory is ordainable to his glory. Again [*thereof*] relates to [*absolute willed*] as [*because*] to [*Therefore*]. And if so, then [*absolutely willed*] relates to *Sin*. And if that is his meaning, that when God decrees to permit sin, sin is absolutely willed by God, because in order to his glory (as God forbid it should be, his meaning) then I say it is a Blasphemy against the nature and word of God. For he is [*Deus non volens Iniquitatem*] a God that willet not Iniquity *Psal.* 5. 4. And when he decrees to permit sin, it is only ex hypothesi and in foresight that men will voluntarily commit sin if they be not hindered by main force, or if the liberty of their wills to sin be not taken away, by their being determin'd, and confin'd. and necessitated to good. But because God decreed that man should be a free Agent, and therein differ, from a Beast, and that he should not be determined to good alone, in his state of mutability. and therein differ from those in heaven who are in a state of confirmation, he did therein decree not to hinder men from sinning by uncreating their natures; and not to hinder sin, is to permit or suffer it. I hope my Adversaries meaning is better then his expression of it, for it cannot be ordainable to God's glory absolutely to will the being of sin, although it may be ordainable to his glory to permit or suffer the being of sin. But I hope he intended that the two middle clauses of this period should only stand as a parenthesis, which is the only way
of

* The particle [*it*] relates to sin, & not possibly to any thing else.

of reconciliation that I am able to imagine. Yet from hence there ariseth a great Advantage to the Truth, however the Author of that period shall explain his meaning. For if he avow's it as his opinion, that sin is absolutely willed by God Almighty; He shall be forced to confess, that he himself makes God to be the Author of sin; and if he disavowes it, he must forsake his present judgment concerning absolute Decrees, as I and others have done before him.

CHAP. X.

E. R.

1. Gods glory is dearer to him than all the things in
 "the world besides are, or can be. 2. Every Attri-
 "bute of God is infinitely and absolutely glorious, and
 "the glory of every one of them, infinitely deare
 "unto him. 3. Whatever is infinitely and absolute-
 "ly glorious in God, he may by an absolute will
 "and purpose decree to shew forth the glory there-
 "of in his works, without fetching an Antecedent
 "reason ab extra, from without himself, leading
 "and inducing him to make such a Decree. 4. The
 "subject on which God is absolutely pleased to manifest
 "the glory of his mercy and justice as to mankind, is
 "Massa perditā. 5. Out of this Masse of lost or
 "lapsed mankind, he hath ex mero beneplacito,
 "chosen some unto Glory and salvation, for the mani-
 "festation of his free and undeserved mercy, and
 "passed by others, leaving them under deserved wrath
 "for the manifestation of his justice, 6. That such
 "and such particular persons out of the same equally
 "corrupted

"corrupted masse are chosen, and others are rejected,
 "belongeth unto the deep and hidden counsel of God,
 "whose judgments are unsearchable, and his wayes
 "past finding out, to whose sovereignty it appertain-
 "eth to form out of the same Lump, one vessel unto
 "Honour, and another unto dishonour, to shew mer-
 "cy on whom he will shew mercy, and to pass by whom
 "he will pass by. 7. God doth so absolutely will and
 "decree ab æterno, the manifestation of the glory of
 "his Attributes, in his works, as that withal he
 "purposeth that the temporary execution of those eter-
 "nal and absolute Decrees shall finally be in mate-
 "ria apta & disposita for such a manifestation.
 "8. All those intermediate dispositions between the
 "decree and the execution thereof, whereby the sub-
 "ject is fitted for such manifestation of God's glory,
 "if they be gracious, they are by God's eternal will,
 "decreed to be wrought, and accordingly are in time
 "effectually wrought by himself, and his grace, in
 "and with the will of the Creature. If they be evil
 "and sinfull, they are in his eternal purpose per-
 "mitted to be wrought, and are in time actually
 "wrought by the deficient and corrupt will of the
 "Creature, and being so wrought, are powerfully orde-
 "red by the wise and holy will of the Creator to his
 "Glory.

T. P.

§ 1. **S**TILL I finde it is worse and worse with him. For having got nothing at all by his chain of *Questions*, he now tries what he can get by 8 propositions, which are in effect the same stuff, but dressed up in another fashion of *Apparrel*, to see if the Reader will like it better in this *Garbe*. His three first propositions may very easily be granted by all the world, but yet his Cause never the *luckier*. The third and highest of the three being again but a *May-be*, how can it do him any pleasure, whilst the contrary *may-be*, as well as That? Himself will grant, that God may decree to fetch a reason [*ab extra*] from without him, viz. from mens actual provocations, the sins most freely committed by them, in the punishment of which he may glorifie his justice, as well as by passing them by in the Loins of Adam. I demand of him and all his party. Is it not at least as just a thing, to decree the misery of the farr greatest part of mankind for those personal Impieties which they do wilfully commit, as for the mer sin of Adam, which was committed by Adam before his posterity had a Being, much less a Will, and a Personality? Here then are at least two equal *May-be's* and I do him a favour, in supposing, my *May-be* no more then equal. But when we say what *may be*, we do not prove what is. That can only be defined by the revealed will of God, which tells us that Christ is the propitiation, not for our sins only (who hope we are of the *Elect*) but for the sins of the whole world, and so unavoidably for the whole *massa corrupta*, for all that were lapsed or lost in Adam. So as no man can be damned for Adam's sin only, without his own, but for adding his own to Adam's sin whereby he forfeiteth his Interest in Christ. But my Assailants unhappiness in his third Question is not yet at an end. For granting him his Doctrine of Man in *Massa* being the object of God's Decree without

*1 John 2. 2.

without any regard to his *actual* sins, we shall find him disputing against Himself. For doth not he by that doctrine, suppose God to fetch a Reason of his Decrees *ab extra*, from without himself, whereby to glorifie his justice in the punishing of man? I say, was not *Adam's* sin, and the corrupted masse in his *Loynes*, every whit as extrinsecal to the Essence of God, as the *actual* corruptions of Cain or Judas? how then doth he dash one part of his arguings against another? If my Assailant is willing that God's Decrees of Predestination should have no motive from without himself, he must destroy his fourth Thesis, and all that lean's on it; and in Reverence to his Third (if he desires to have it any more then a *may be*) he must presently set up for a *Supralapsarian*, and send a farewell to the Synod of Dort.

§. 2. His fourth position doth declare, that he is for the *Sublapsarian* way, notwithstanding what he had said but 2 lines going before. And here he shew's his Inconsistence with the greatest Pillars of his own Party, in his stating the object of Predestination, and affirming it to be *Massa Perdita*. For first, herein he sets himself against *Beza*, and all his followers, who are for *Massa nondum condita*. Next he disobligeeth *Franciscus Junius*, as able a Card as most are in the Pack, who is for *Massa condita nec dum corrupta*. Thirdly, He is at variance with honest *Piscator* (as Mr. B. calls him) who is for no less then a *Threefold Masse*, 1 *nondum condita*, 2 *condita dumtaxat*, 3 *condita & corrupta*. Fourthly, he affronteth his own Dr. *Trisse*, whom he commended for his Acquaintance with the mind of God, and who although he prefers *Piscators* opinion before the rest, yet he condemns *Piscators* too; and sets up, in the room, *who-can-tell-what*? Fifthly, He opposeth the famous *Moulin* of Sedan, who sits the Truth in the midst, and (as to this particular) hath one foot in the *Consistorie*, but another in the Church. Touching the object of Election, he holds indeed with the *Calvinists*; but touching the object of Reprobation, he runs full speed with the *Remonstrants*.

h Twiss. vind.
Gra. l. 1. par.
1. Digr. 4.
Sec. 4. c. 3.
p. 84.

Dr. Twisse his
argument a-
gainst my As-
sailant's Opi-
nion of *Massa*
perdita &c.
and against
the *Correptory*
Correptor, his
Beloved Timo-
thy.
Si Reprobatio
presupponat
massam corrup-
tam, etiam ge-
nus humanum
conditum pra-

supponat necesse est : at si creatio in Intentione divina prior sit quam Damnatio, in executione prior erit Damnatio quam Creatio. Ad eundem modum. Si prius intenderet Deus peccatum Originale permittere quam damnare, sequeretur prius hominem oportuisse damnari, quam peccati originalis ingressum permitti. (Nam quod in Intentione est posterius est prius in executione.) Quae omnia tam deliriosa sunt, ut in hominem sana sentientem cadere non possint.
Vind. Grat. l. 1. par. 1. Digr. 4. c. 3. p. 87.

Sixthly, He differs from Mr. Calvin, as Mr. Calvin differs from himself, who although in the general for *Massa Corrupta*, yet he is sometimes also for *nondum condita*. Seventhly, he despiseth his Reverend Friend Mr. Barlee, who professeth to be a good friend to both the upper and lower way, though Dr. Twisse hath (h) discovered a very great Gulf fixt betwixt the one, and the other; and saith that they of the lower way, whilst they try to escape the darts of their Enemies, are compell'd to fight under their Banner. Well therefore said Mr. Barlee, that he is for both, that is, for neither, because indeed he is for nothing unless for *Correptory Correction*. To satisfy my Reader for my being thus long, I ought to be a little longer, that I may tell him the pretty Jest of Dr. Twisse his arguing, against all his Friends and Admirers without exception; and though he builds upon a Fallacy, yet his Friends are so far from having seen where it lyes, that they have swallowed it down as a *postulatum*; and because they use it as a medium against the doctrine of the *Remonstrants*, Doctor Twisse hath ruin'd their Cause for ever.

“ If Reprobation presupposeth a *Massa Corrupta*, it must needs presuppose mankind created. But if the Creation was looner in God's intention then Damnation, then Damnation shall be sooner in Execution, then Creation. In the same manner; If God did sooner intend to permit *Original sin* then to damn, it would follow that man should be damn'd before *Original sin* is permitted to enter into the world (for what is first in Intention must be last in execution) all which things are so foolish, as not to enter into a man who is in his wits.

Here

SECT. 3. with the chieftains of his Party.

107

Here we see it is evident, that Dr. *Twisse* doth heap the greatest disgraces upon the Calvinistical opinion in the *Synod at Dort*, that can be possibly imagined. For he affirmeth it to infer the grossest absurdities in the world, as that men are damn'd in Hell before the world is created, and actually punished for sin before the entrance of sin into the world; things implying contradictions, and such as none but mad men can entertain, saith Dr. *Twisse*. Yet old Mr. *Whitfield* is so thankful, for having his Doctrine and his Person so implicitly reproached by Dr. *Twisse*, that he swallows his axiom as a wholesome Bit, and upon the strength of its nourishment, he fights (in his first animadversion) against the man in the Moon.

§. 3. In the fifth position of my *Rd. Assailant*, I am glad to find him saying what God hath done *ex mero beneplacito*, no longer now what he may only.* Only I wish he had given some shew of reason and offered at least at some kind of proof, that I might have had an opportunity to answer. But since he hath crudely affirmed, what he supposeth to be true, I will patiently expect, untill his leisure will permit him to prove 3. things. 1. That God hath absolutely (not now that he may, but that he hath) without any fore-sight or consideration how his talents will be used, chosen some to glory, & left the rest to inherit a Lake of Fire, which is unquenchable. 2. That his undeserved and free mercy cannot as well be manifested another way, to wit, in giving his free grace, and rewarding with infinite unproportionable Joyes; very weak and imperfect, very light & short obedience. 3ly, and especially, that he hath passed by others, and left them under deserved wrath, meerly considered in that state which the First man brought upon them, (when yet on the contrary Christ was given a propitiation for that whole Masse, as the Scripture very expressly, and very frequently affirmeth.) And 'till these three things are proved, his sixth proposition will weigh as lightly as his fifth. Because it matters not to inquire, to what purposes and counsels the electing or rejecting men in *Massâ* doth belong, untill it is proved that there is any

such thing, as that in *Massâ* they are elected or rejected. Nor is the Question of his sovereignty, what he may, but of his decree, what he will; and what is revealed in his word concerning what he will do, which, if it is not there revealed, we cannot know. Just as little material are his seventh and eighth propositions, which do wholly stand and subsist upon the Credit of the fifth; nor must the fifth be granted untill it is proved. Yet if care must be taken in the seventh, that this matter spoken of be finally apt and disposed for the manifestation of Gods Glory, and if 'tis confessed in the eighth, that this is actually wrought by the corrupt will of the Creature, then it seems the Creature as it lies in *Massâ*, without any acts of its own corrupt will, is not fit to be punished, or to manifest Gods Glory in being punished; and if so, then how could that be the subject (in the fourth proposition) on which God is absolutely pleased to manifest the glory of his Justice? In plainer words, If untill the Creature hath actually sinned, it is not [*materia apta & disposita*] matter fitly disposed for the eternal vengeance of the Almighty, or for the manifesting his Glory in their eternal punishment, then even my Adversary must acknowledge (upon his own grounds) that there cannot in *massâ* be any absolute Preterition. Thus his seventh proposition is the destruction of his fifth, and brings him over to my opinion, by irresistible consequence, even before he is aware; for he confesseth that the matter of Reprobation must be fitly disposed, and that it must be by the corrupt will of the Creature, but he knows that the Reprobates had no such thing as a will when they were in *massâ*, some thousands of years before they were born; and therefore they must be born, and have wills of their own, before their wills can be corrupted, or make them matter adapted for condemnation, and as they are in time, just so they were considered from all Eternity. But to conclude this Chapter. If all were granted which is desired in these eight propositions, yet would it not come home to Mr. Barlee's pretensions, who saith that God is not a meer legislator of conditional Decrees, Laws, and Statutes, but
 "An absolute Determiner in a soveraign way of the se-
 "veral

Sect. 2. The worst effects of the worst Doctrin. 109

"veral acts of **Disobedience** in relation to them, & though
 "he saith also, that God himself is *without sin*, and determines
 the several acts of obedience also, yet that doth not lessen,
 but rather aggravate his *Blasphemy*; because he makes no
 difference betwixt Gods determining the Acts of obedience and
Disobedience, whilst he saith he is an **Absolute** [uncondition-
 nal] **Determiner**, of both the one, and the other. Whither
James Nayler hath said any thing like it, I have not hi-
 therto been inform'd; but They who adored him as a *Christ*
 did give the *Magistrate* this reason, (l) That they were for-
 ced thereunto by the power of the Lord; and (m) commanded
 so of the Lord; and thereunto (n) moved of the Lord; and
 (o) directed by the spirit of the Lord: And when the *Presby-*
terian Ministers of the Kirk of Scotland sent a Letter to the
 Lord Hamilton inviting Him to head their Forces (which
 without the least pretense of Authority of Parliament, the
Preachers and **They only** had made to rise,) they told his
 Lordship in their Letter, (p) that the people were animated by
 the word and motion of Gods Spirit to take up Arms; that
 is, to **Rebel**. Now by what principles and opinions they
 were betray'd to these things, I leave it to be judged by o-
 ther men. It is in perfect hatred to blasphemous speeches a-
 gainst God, but not for want of perfect charity to any mans
 person in the world, that I am forced to name the Authors
 of such *Impiety*, which if I should not do, I might be susp-
 ected by a few to have born falseness. For the peace, and
 safety, of Church, and State, as well as for the Interest, and
 good of Souls, I am (q) obliged and concerned to deliver mine
 own soul by giving fair (q) warnings to other mens. And
 may it for ever be remembred by such as are of a party,
 which they are kinde to, and extreemly willing to excuse,
 That he who (r) justifieth the wicked is an Abomination to the
 Lord, as well as He who condemneth the just. To shew my
 (l) Innocence from so great a Transgression as the latter, I
 have not whispred my Accusations in a Corner, but spoken
 them out unto the world; nor have I urged them from gid-
 dy Rumors and Reports, (as one sort of men are wont to
 do

1 The Grand
 Impostor. p. 25.
 m p. 28. & 31.
 n p. 30.
 o p. 32.

p Spotswood
 Hist. Scot. l. 6.
 p. 330, 331.

97 Lev. 19. 17.
 Ezek. 33. 7.
 8, 9, 10.
 Ezek. 34. 2,
 4, 8, 10.
 Amos 5. 10.
 17 Prov. 17. 15.
 18 Psal. 19 13.

do) but from the *published writings* which I *accuse*; as may be seen in the *Catalogues* which I have heretofore made.

CHAP. XI.

E. R.

So then, 1. God did, ab æterno, most absolutely
 “will and decree his own Glory, as the supream end
 “of all consulting therein the counsel of his own will,
 “and not the wills of any of his Creatures. 2. In or-
 “der unto that supream end, he did freely elect some
 “Angels, and some lapsed men unto blessedness; for
 “he might do with his own gifts what he would him-
 “self. 3. In order to the same supream end, he did
 “leave some Angels, and some lapsed men to them-
 “selves, to their own mutability and corruption, not
 “being a debtor unto any of them. 4. But he did
 “not ordain any Creature to absolute Damnation,
 “but to damnation for sin, into which they fall (as
 “they themselves know) by their own wills, and
 “whereof they are themselves the alone Causes
 “and Authors. Gods work about sin being only a wil-
 “ling permission, and a wise, powerful, and holy
 “Gubernation, but no actual efficiency unto the
 “formal being and obliquity thereof. I am sorry I
 “am led on by mine own thoughts thus far into your
 “proper work. But here I stop.

T.P.

T. P.

§. 1. **O**Nce more he begins with *four Positions*, trying whether *this* course will be more *prosperous* than the former. So (1) *Dalilah* cast about *which way* to binde *Sampson*, that his *strength* might depart from him. So when (2) *Balak* was *successless* upon the *high places* of *Baal*, he brought *Balaam* (to do his work) into the field of *Zophim* on the top of *Pisgah*; and when *that* also was in *vain*, He would trye *another* mountain, and therefore brought him to the *Top of Pear*; for peradventure (said he) it will please God that thou may'st curse me *thence*. But 'twas strange that *Balak* should imagin any vertue in the meer change of places, when the *Cause* of his war was still the same. And I cannot but wonder, that my *Assailant* should *attaque* me by several sets of *Questions* and *Propositions*, when he knows the *matter* is still the same. Mine *Host* in *Livie* did not amiss when he made such variety of unexpected *Dishes*, all of one and the same *Porket*, in entertainment of the *Embassadors* who came from *Rome*. But in the management of a *controversie* it cannot be so *graceful*, to say the same thing often in several *shapes*; yet as a token of my respect, I will proceed to say something to this last *Qua-*
ternio of *Propositions*.

§. 2. The first is granted by all the world, for no man living can be so mad, as to say, or think, that God consulted the will of the Creature in decreting his own Glory. The second is back't with a shew of Reason; and it runs in this Form, [He did, for he might;] but *a potentiâ ad Actum non valet argumentum*. God might have made us all, as he did *Adam*, out of the *Earth*, without the methods of generation, and *Birth*, but hence it follows not that he did. Nor was there need of any proof, (much less of that which was worse then none) for the confirming of an asser-

tion

tion. which Nothing in Christendome ever denied, for all unanimously agree, that God did freely elect some Angels, and some men. If any quarrel with him for his first position, they must be a Sect of his own party (which I shewed before to be multifariously subdivided) to wit the *supralapsarians*, who perhaps will require him to blot out the word *Lapsed*, although they need not to be so nice. For that the men who are elected, as sons of Adam, are lapsed too, Dr. Twisse himself could not deny. And the Remonstrants do all allow, that actual sins suppose a Lapse. Only my Assailant must here be minded, that by the word [freely] he must not mean [necessarily or unconditionally;] for if he does, there is not a Dictionary in the world will bear him out. Our Faith and Obedience do merit nothing, nor indeed are they ours but by God's free gift, nor do they bear any proportion with an eternal weight of Bliss and Glory, so that the mercy of God is free though it exacts somewhat of us to make us capable of it. Which he that ventures to deny, must either deny that God exacts any Duties from his Elect, or that the Graces of God are free. If the former, he opens a Dore unto the Libertines; and if the latter, he ruins the Cause which he asserteth. He needed not here have mentioned Angels, as not belonging to the matter of which he treats (for they were never in Adams Loyns) And of them he must be told, (since he hath put them into his Thesis) that God eternally foresaw that some of them would persevere, and not follow Lucifer in his voluntary defection, and that for their voluntary Obedience he would reward them with Confirmation. (So we know he doth

men, when he takes them up into their Masters' (w) Joy.) which if my Assailant will deny, I know not what should scare him from Embracing the way of the *Supralapsarians*. But come we from Angels to men, of whom in relation to this matter, the plain truth is briefly this. God was in Christ (x) reconciling the world unto himself, who from all eternity elected, in Christ, those that he saw would persevere in the Faith of Christ (which Faith is not salvifick, unless it (y) worketh by Love, all manner of duty which God

w Mat. 25. 21.

x 2 Cor. 5. 19.

y Gal. 5. 6.

Se&t. 1, 2. *Respective nevertheless.*

113

God requires, in whomsoever he doth require it.) And all this he did freely, and justly might do; yet he did it not therefore, because he might, but because he chose it as most for his *Glory* to be done. And we know he did so, (not because we know he might, but) because he hath been pleased to assure us of it in his word.

§. 2. His third position, or proposition, he could not but know, would be denied, and yet his offer of proof is very feeble. He know's it is denied that God did leave some lapsed men to unavoidable Damnation, meerly as lying in Adams Loins; which he cannot possibly be thought to have done, if he gave his own Son to be a Ransome and Sacrifice for Adam's sin, and a propitiation for all that were in Loins. Which this Reverend Author doth not once offer to deny throughout his whole Preface. And for his proof of the supposed Preterition, if it is any at all, it is but this, That God was not a debtor to any of them, who were thus left to Damnation in Adams Loins. Which at its utmost Improvement hath but the force of another *may-be*. And is this a strong Argument [God did leave some lapsed men in mass, because he might, without doing them any wrong?] How much more rationally may it be argued even the same irrational way (I mean by a *may-be*, à *potentiâ ad actum*.) God did not leave any by an absolute preterition in mass, because he might give Christ for all that Masse, and might shew mercy to all then lying in Adams Loins, without doing wrong to any vessel of Election, whose Eye, ought not to be *† evil* because God is good? Besides, it is a cold *† Mat. 20. 15:* commendation of any tolerable Christian, to say he doth no wrong, and that the rule of his Actions is meer legality. God forbid that we should do whatsoever is barely and merely lawful, (for many things that are lawful, are not *expedient) or content our selves with doing no more. A * *1 Cor. 6. 12.* good man is desirous, not only to do no wrong to & ch. 10. 23. his Neighbour, but all the good that he is able. From whence we may argue à fortiori, That he who is kinde to the (z) unthankful and to the (z) evil, and commandeth us to *z Luke 6. 36.* be merciful as (a) He is merciful, by loving (z) our Enemies, *a Verse 37.*

Q

as

- as he did *his*, was more likely to shew mercy upon *all* that were in *massa*, because he is *kinde* to his Creatures, and delighteth to forgive, and in the *midst* of (b) judgement remembreth mercy, then to leave them in *Adams* loyns under a desperate impossibility of being saved, or of having any Interest in the Saviour of the (c) world, and all because he is no mans Debtor. The Psalmist saith plainly, That the *mercy of God is over *all his works. He saith not Justice, but Mercy, which importeth much more then the doing no wrong. Nor doth He say that God's Mercy is over some of his works, but over *all* without exception. Which how could David affirm with Truth, if the far greatest part of mankind, (the very noblest of all his works under the Canopy of Heaven) had been decreed to infinite and endless Torments, without the least respect or consideration, of any one the least sin committed actually by any one of them? Suppose it were Justice to damn an Infant of a day old to all eternity merely as descending from him, who descended from him, who descended from him, who (after a succession of numberless Generations) descended from him, who descended from Adam, yet where were the Mercy to that poor Infant? My Assailant in this place must either contradict David, by denying that Gods Mercy is over all his works, or say with Dr. Twisse, that it is better to be miserable for ever, than not to be; and so a comparative Mercy to that Infant, not to annihilate him, but to allow him the Dignity of a Creature, and an Immortality in Hell, where is weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of Teeth, where the worm dieth not, and where the fire is not quenched. But I will sum up my Answer to his third position, in these few words. That God is merciful above (d) all that wee can to ask or think, and may give, as well as not give, what he owes us not. Otherwise I am sure it could not be free grace. And that he really doth, what he thus may, He tells us as often as he saith, that he giveth Christ to dye for all; in giving whom, he giveth (e) all things, which are sufficient, and necessary to mans salvation. And though of the all that are called and called seriously) but (f) few are chosen, yet it is not for want of a

series

Se&.2.3'. D.R. irreconcilable with M.Barlee. 115

serious call on God's part, but because all that are called do not (g) answer; or if they answer, they do not (h) come; or if they come, they do not (k) stay with him; they wilfully (l) reject the counsel of God against themselves. And so have received the grace of God * in vain.

g lsa. 50.1. &
66. 4.
h Luk:14.20.
k Mar.10.12.
l 11867000
rld Buallu
rū 707
Luke 7. 30.
* 2 Cor.6.1.

§. 3. The Fourth proposition in this Section being wholly the same with the seventh and eighth of the former Section may be sent thither for its Answer, as having there sufficiently been spoken to, yet here my Assailant is to be thank't for saying so plainly, and expressly, [That men do fall into Damnation, as they themselves know, by their own wills, and whereof themselves are the alone Causes and Authors] For if this is heartily acknowledged (as here it is very plainly) Then 1. Farewell to Austin's rigid sentence pronounced upon unbaptized Infants; for the Infants fall not by their own wills, or against the light of their understandings, they having no use of either faculty. 2. Farewell all consideration of Adams sin in the Damnation of any Creature; for they that are damned (saith my Assailant) are the alone Causes and Authors of their Damnation; and if so, then was Adam no part of the Cause or Author. If I had said thus much, how many times had I been called a Semipelagian? and of what Corruptory Correction had I been thought worthy? But now 3. Farewell to all that is said by Mr. Barlee against the second Chapter of my Notes. For I had said only that man is the sole efficient Cause, and explain'd myself sufficiently by saying that Satan and the Protoplast were Promoters of my Guilt (p.6.) But my Assailant saith farther, that mans own will is the alone Cause, and the alone Author of his Sin and Damnation. Which gives me occasion to admire, how M. Barlee could read this passage in his worthiest Friend, and raile so vehemently against it, as to say it (m) fights against God, against Scripture, against all Authority, antient, and later? Again I admire, how D. Reynolds could read all that bitterness of his Friend against this part of his own Epistle, and yet retain this proposition which is there so rai'd at; yea and how he could commend his Reviler's work for an Elaborate

m Corrupt.
Correct. p.
94. to 100.
especially p.
96, 97.

and learned Thing. Nor is the wonder lessened, in that the ill language of all those pages is directed to me by name, and not to D. Reynolds, since the Doctrine against which the ill language is levell'd, is delivered by D. Reynolds, as well as by me, nay, by D. Reynolds after me, nay, by D. Reynolds in defense of me even in that Epistle which was intended against me in partiality to Mr. Barlee, nay, by D. Reynolds more obnoxiously and more unwarily then by me, nay, more like Massilian and Pelagian by D. Reynolds then by me. Let both our words be considered, and I do seriously believe, that he himself will say as much.

§. 4. What is added in the position concerning God's Permission and gubernation &c. is *gratis didum*, as to me, and cannot with any the least colour be fitly aimed against my words, who said as much in my Notes (§. 12.) But only against his and my Correptory Corrector, who besides permission and Gubernation, disposing, and ordering, is for Determination, and stirring up, as a Man puts spurs to a Dull Fide, (it is his own simile.) So that if my Rd. Assailant doth here mean no more then he speaks, not conceiving that God's will of permitting sin is efficacious, nor that he doth impel men to any thing that is unlawful, nor that he did Decree Adam to contract a (n) viriosity by his Fall, (as Dr. Twisse speaks.) then the things which I accused as blasphemous may still be blasphemous by his free leave; and I shall once more thank him for having thus joyned with me against the Correptory Corrector. And since he professeth to be sorry for having been led so far in another mans proper work, I will have so fair an opinion of him as to believe, that from this time forward, he will express his sorrow by his Amendment.

n Nam & de-
crevit Ada-
mum, ex lap-
su suo, vicio-
tatem natura
immobilem
contracturum.
Twiss. Vind.
Gra l. 1. par.
2. Digr. 8.
Sect. 4. p. 115.

CHAP. XII.

E. R.

I was glad to see two orthodox and sound Axi-
 oms, stand before the book of your Author as the
 Basis of his Superstructure. Two men of quite
 different judgments in these very Arguments I find
 to have done so before. The one Cassianus the Col-
 lator, of whom Prosper hath these words, Catholi-
 carum tibi aurium judicia conciliare voluisti,
 quibus de præmissæ Professionis fronte securis,
 facile sequentia irreperent, si prima placuissent.
 Which words of his bring into my mind a saying of
 the Historian, Fraus fidem in parvis sibi præ-
 struit, ut cum operæ pretium sit, cum magnâ
 mercede fallat; and the censure of Austin upon
 Pelagius, Gratia vocabulo frangit Invidiam,
 & offensionem declinat. The other the famous
 Arch-Bishop Bradwardine (whom learned and
 good men will honour, notwithstanding the hard cen-
 sure passed by Hugo Grotius upon him) who pre-
 miseth two Hypotheses as the ground of that pro-
 found work of his, De Causâ Dei. I will have so fair
 and just an opinion of your Author, as to believe
 that he did this in Candor and Integrity, follow-
 ing therein rather the learned example of Bradwar-
 din, then (if Prosper's Censure may be taken) the
 Artifice and cunning of Cassianus; yet because
 this is a course, which may by the Credit of true
 Princi-

Prosper cont.
Collat. c. 14.

Liv. decad.
3. l. 8.

Aug. de Grat.
Christi. cap.

39.

"Principles, draw the less cautelous and circumspect
 "Readers, to consent to deductions not naturally
 "consequent upon them; it is requisite, as for wri-
 "ters, as Pliny adviseth, Sæpius respicere Titu-
 "lum, so for Readers to follow the Apostles Counsel,
 "to prove all things, and hold fast that which
 "is good.

T. P.

o Luke 6. 43.

§. 1. **T**His is somewhat a strange Paragraph in several respects. For first 'tis apparently *unkind*, because although he professeth that I had *two* great patterns for what I did, whereof one was most excellent in his *own opinion*; nay, though he professeth to have *so just an opinion of me*, as to believe I followed *Bradwardin* rather than *Cassianus*, and that I *did what I did in Candor and integrity*, he did yet make *choise* to begin his *Descants* upon the *other*; not insisting on the *good meaning* of *Arch-Bishop Bradwardin*, but on the *fraud & cunning* of the *Presbyter Cassianus*. Yet *secondly*, he makes me some part of requital by confessing my *two principles* to be a couple of *orthodox and sound Axioms*, and that they were the *Basis* of my *superstructure*. Now he cannot but confess, that where the *deductions* are *duly made*, nothing but *truth* can be inferred from *truth*: such good (o) *Trees*, as *two orthodox and sound Axioms*, cannot bring forth such corrupt fruit, as my *Notes* were accused of by the *Correptorie Corrector*. Had not my *Deductions* been *naturally consequent* upon my grounds, (as here it is *hinted*, and *meerly hinted*, but no where *held forth*, that I can find,) no doubt but some of the *grieved party* would have endeavoured at least to find it out. And had they found any *such thing*, no doubt but I should have heard on't with both my *Ears*. They cannot say that they were not at *leisure*; for the *ilness* of a *deduction* might have been shewed in *few lines*, and they had *leisure* in *abundance*

to

Sect. 2. To the Grounds of all I said.

119

to amuse the Reader with other things, which (in their own confession) must needs have been wholly impertinent, if my deductions were legal from such unquestionable grounds. And they tacitly confess that my Deductions were legal, by not attempting to shew me their illegality.

§. 2. My Reverend Assailant thinks I followed the example of learned *Bradwardin*, in my choice of those grounds: but Mr. B. is peremptory, that Dr. *Jackson* was my Example. Why could they not have thought, that the Reverend Bishop *Davenant* might be the man, who hath the * substance of my two grounds in his Epistle to Du- * Sentent. D.
rens? Why not St. *James*? Chap. 1. 13, 14, 15, 17. Ra- Davenantii.
ther why not every man, or no man at all? For is there any P. 20.
thing more obvious in the very writings of the Heathen, or in the Hearts and Mouths of all who are not quite inhumane, then that all our good things are from the Fountain of goodness, that is, from God, and all our evils from their Fountain too, that is, our own corrupt wills consenting to the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the Devil? These are such known and vulgar Truths, that they might have been expected from any A. B. C. darian, who is but a little catechized in the Elements of Religion, without recourse to a *Bradwardin*, and then perhaps much less to a Dr. *Jackson*. That *Cassianus* did use that Method, as well as *Bradwardin*, is as much to *Bradwardin's* prejudice, as it can be to mine; although it ought not to be to either. For *Cassianus* was a learned and pious man; and so commended even by *Prosper* who writ against him, and who calls him somewhere *Virum divinum*, though I can now as little finde out the place where, as I can finde out that speech in his 14th. Chapter, to which by the Margin of my Assailant I am directed. The worst that can be said of *Cassianus*, is, that being a *Semipelagian* he erred on the right hand, which however to be misliked, is yet exceedingly preferable to *Semimanicheisme*, which will easily be proved to be an Error on the left. *Prosper* (p) confesseth of the *Semipelagians*, that they were eminent, and godly, and learned men, and such

Prosper in
Epist. ad Aug.
de relig. Pe-
lag. Her.
p. 884.

q Illud etiam
qualiter dilua-
tur, quæsumus;
patienter Insi-
pientiam no-
stram ferendo
demonstres,
&c. Id. Ibid.
p. 886.

r — Et hoc
non solum alio-
rum Catholio-
rum Testimoni-
is, sed etiam
sanctitatis tua
disputatione
antiquiore se
probare testan-
tur, ut & illud
quod, &c. Hil-
lar. Arcl. in
Epist. ad
Aug. mihi p.
1199.

f Hæc ego & a-
lia quæ hunc
sequuntur erro-
rem, credo quod
vir ille tam
egregie Chri-
stianus omnino
non sentiet.
Aug. de Pec-
cat. merit &
Remiss. l. 3.
c. 3. Nos non
oportet adver-
tere istum. —

hæc & prædicandum virum. Ibid. Pelagii quædam Scripta legi, viri, ut audio, Sancti
& non parvo profectu Christiani. Ib. c. 1. (t) unde & isti qui contra hæc disputant,
cum sint casta vitæ, moribusque laudabiles, nec dubitant facere quod illi diviti pro con-
sequendâ vitâ aternâ consilium requirenti, cum se respondisset jam omnia legis implevisse
mandata, præcepit Dominus, si vellet esse perfectus, venderet omnia quæ haberet, & daret
pauperibus, thesaurumque transferret in Calum. August. de pec. mer. & Remiss. contra
Pelag. lib. 2. cap. 16. commendation

such with whom he was not able to compare, either for
strength of Argument, or unblamableness of life. He far-
ther (q) confessed to the same Austin, to whom he confes-
sed all the rest, that their Reasonings were such, as he was
not able to answer, upon which he desired that Fathers help.
(r) St. Hilarie also told Austin, that the Massilians in
France did hold no more concerning grace, then they quo-
ted Him for, as well as other Catholick Fathers; and Him
they quoted for what he had written in his dispute against
Porphyrie; wherein he spake as if he had spoken out of
the Semipelagian's mouth, when indeed the Semipelagians
did speak expressly out of his. And because my Reverend
Assailant hath noted Austins censure upon Pelagius, I will
also note how much Pelagius was revered by the very
same Austin at other times; not because I am concerned
in the credit of Pelagius or Cassianus, any more then any
man who loves to give his very enemies their due, but be-
cause I would shew how little of argument there is in the
censures of Prosper and of Austin, produced here by my
Assailant in this part of his Epistle. First, for (s) Pelagius
himself, we have Austin speaking so highly of him, that he
professeeth not to believe, that so excellent a christian as Pela-
gius should assent to those Errors of which he was reported to
have been guilty. And then for the Sect of the (t) Pelagi-
ans in general, St. Austin hath liberally declared, that
though they disputed against that which he asserted, yet he
could not but acknowledge that they were men of good life,
and laudable for their manners, and such as did not scruple to
obey the very strictest of Christs commands, even by selling all
they had and giving it to the poor; such were the Pelagians,
and such was Pelagius, if we believe that Austin who was
the greatest Enemy to him, and Them; and sure an Enemies

Se&t. 2. Pelagius commended by S. Austin.

121

commendation is not likely to be untrue. If the greatest haters of the Pelagians Doctrins had not been the greatest Haters of their example, [*selling all, and giving to the poor,*] it had been better then now it is, with the men who are at Enmity with each extream.

CHAP. XIII.

E. R.

I observe in your Author, much credit given to a
 "Paper published under the name of Bishop An-
 "drews: If Controversies were to borrow their cre-
 "dit from the Names of men, you could easily oppose
 "the great Bishop of Hippo, and a cloud of many o-
 "ther learned men, unto that great Name. But I
 "know not whether the Ipse dixit of an Anonymous
 "publisher, be attestation enough to prove the Au-
 "thenticallness of that Paper. Dr. Sanderson, a
 "learned writer, who once drew the diverse opinions
 "touching these controversies into Tables, speaketh
 "of Dr. Overal's judgement, but maketh no mention
 "of this. And the two Prelates, unto whom the pub-
 "lication of his Opuscula, was by special order refer-
 "red, do not give any account of this paper to the
 "world, but (that which seems to induce the contra-
 "ry) they diligently satisfie the Reader, Cur hæc &
 "non alia (speaking of the things by them published)
 "sibi ad scribendum delegerit. Therefore it is
 "probable, that either they owned not this as his, or
 "willingly suppressed it; for something they did sup-
 "press, as they intimate in these words, illud qui-

R

"dem

"dem nobis curæ fuit, ne quicquam prodiret,
 "cujus occasione sancti manes queri jure pos-
 "sent famæ suæ apud Posteror male consul-
 "tum à nobis esse. Therefore till I come to have a
 "better assurance of it, then the Testimony of the
 "two letters, F. G. and the company of Fur præ-
 "destinatus. I shall take the liberty of an *mix* in
 "this particular.

T. P.

* See what
 Austin said of
 the Pelagians
 charity, in the
 place above
 cited.

§. 1. **I** Do willingly profess to be a great Admirer of Bi-
 shop Andrews, not only as Master of 15. *Langua-*
ges, an irresistible Disputant against our Churches Ene-
 mies of each extreame, a most unimitable Preacher, a Bar
 to sacrilege and schisme, a very * Pelagian in point of
 charity, (though not of Doctrine) a Conservator of Disci-
 pline, a Patron to publick peace, (and a good friend to Gro-
 tius,) but as a vindicator of God's Essence, and Attributes,
 from all that tendeth to his dishonour. And were there
 no one man, besides the renowned Bishop Andrews, to be al-
 leaged against the fancy of irrelative decrees, and the other
 fictions which issue thence, he would exceedingly outweigh
 whatsoever stands in the contrary scale. To whom it was not
 fairly done to oppose the Bishop of Hippo, because the Bishop
 of Hippo doth speak as much for the Doctrines of Bishop An-
 drews as he can be pretended to speak against them. And
 if he is found to speak both, that is, For and against, it is
 his own (t) desire that he may not be heeded: for having
 found by sad experience that he was subject to great mistakes,
 he desired the Readers of his works to use their liberty of

Neque quo-
 rumlibet Dis-
 putationes
 quamvis Ca-

tholicorum & laudatorum hominum, velut Scripturas Canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis
 non liceat Salvâ honorificentia, que illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum Scriptis impro-
 bare atque respicere, si forte invenerimus, quod aliter senserint, quam veritas habet, divino
 adjutorio, vel ab aliis intellecta, vel a nobis. Talis ego sum in Scriptis aliorum, Tales
 volo esse Intellectores meorum. August. Epist. 3. ad Fortunat.

reject.

rejecting what they should finde to be *amiss*, and also pro-
fessed not to take it as any *dishonour* or *disrespect* to either
his *quality*, or his *learning*; of which as I have given suffici-
ent *proofs* in other places, so now in my *margin*, I adde
another. I have two *Reasons* to alledge why the judge-
ment of *Bishop Andrews*, the great *Bishop of Winchester*,
is (in this particular at least which lies before us, not only
as much, but perhaps) much more to be esteemed, then the
judgement of *Austin* the great *Bishop of Hippo*. 1. Au-
stin was actually betrayed into greater *Errors*, then can be
pretended to the prejudice of the other. For not to speak of
his praying to *Saints*, and his praying for the dead, of which
he is accused by *Mr. Rivet*, the *Presbyterian*, not only as of
an *Error*, but as of a very great crime; nor to speak of his
many *Massilian Doctrines* which *St. Hilarie* himself alleag-
ed to him very frankly out of several of his writings; what
(u) grosser mistake could there be, then even that which he
discovered in his *Dispute* against the *Pelagians*, when it most
concerned him to have been *wary*? I mean his *Error* of be-
lief, that no *Infant* could be saved without the receiving of the
Communion, as well as the *Sacrament* of *Baptisme*, and his *guilt* de *Pec-*
wresting of that *Text John 6. 53.* to authorize so great an
Error, and (which is most to be admired) his great
(w) *Triumphs* thereupon, as if his argument from thence
were not possibly to be answered. 2. Where *Austin* diffe-
red from *Bishop Andrews* touching the points now contro-
verted (if yet he must be said sometimes to differ) he also
differed from all his own *Teachers*, the *Fathers of the Church*
who went before him, for four Centuries after *Christ*; who
did unanimously hold, that the *Decree of Election* (much
more of *Reprobation*) is *respective and conditional*, and that
not only of *Faith*, but of *perseverance unto the end too*; which
is confessed (x) by *Prosper*, and by (y) *Austin* himself ap-
proved of.

nem, non habebitis vitam eternam,] Quid ultra querimus? Quid ad hoc respondere
poterunt? An vero quisquam etiam hoc dicere audebit, quod ad parvulos hec sententia non
pertineat possintque sine participatione Corporis huius & sanguinis in se habere vitam?
Id. ib. c. 20. p. 666. (x) Prosper in Epist. ad Aug. p. 886. (y) Aug. de bono pers. c. 19 & 20.

§. 2. To the Arguments which he useth against the *Authenticness* of that *Piece* which I delighted to make use of in my *Notes on God's Decrees*, I have several things to return him by way of *Answer*. 1. Dr. *Sandersons* making no mention of it is but a *negative Argument*, and therefore signifies very little to an intelligent Reader. 2. Nor can he possibly be ignorant, that Dr. *Sanderson's Tables* were quite finished before this piece of B. *Andrews* was sent forth into the light. But how can any man expect, that he should mention a writing, which he had not then the opportunity of seeing? Or if he had, could he be thought to mention *All he ever saw*? He had reason to mention the famous Opinion of Bp. *Overal*, because it had something peculiar which made it famous; and if he thought he had not the same reasons to mention that of Bp. *Andrews*, how can He or I help it? 3. There was something else which the two Prelates did very willingly suppress, as his pattern of *Catechistical Doctrine*, which yet my Rd. *Assailant* will not deny to have been his, because it was not published by special order. But 4. There was some reason for the suppression of this, as well as that. Not because this was the issue of his *Youth*, as well as that, (for this he did in his riper years) but because they published his *Opuscula* much about that Time, when the publick Discussion of these Points were interdicted by special order, and because this Piece was not so polished by its Author, as the other things in that Volume, which they committed to the Press. 5. Nor ought it more to be censured for being found in the Company of *Fur Predestinatus*, then *Fur Predestinatus* ought to be censur'd for being the Title of a Book, or for being found in the company of the *Articuli Lamberhani*. They say that *Fur Predestinatus* is an ingenious Dialogue, which hath nothing of ill in it, except the Doctrines of those Men who help't the Thief to presumption, in lieu of Faith. And those are there mention'd for righteous ends; viz. by way of prevention to one sort of Readers, and by way of Remedy to another: that some may be afraid of entertaining such Doctrines, and that others may

may be *ashamed* of having *taught* them. 6. As it hath hitherto appeared, that there is not any *force* in any one of *those reasons*, which would not have men believe that that small piece is Bp. *Andrews's*, so there are *reasons* for the *contrary* of force sufficient. For 1. The *language* and the *frame*, and the inward *spirit* of the thing, do partly tell us that it is *His*, who may be *guessed* at by his *finger*, as well as *Hercules* by his *Foot*. 2. Part of it is discernable even in some of those *Sermons*, whose publication was referred to the *Bishops* of *London*, and of *Ely*, except that the *one* hath it in *Latin*, as the *other* in *English*. 3. The *Publisher* of it, *F. G.* (if I rightly *guess* at him) is both a learned and pious man, whose *Integrity* would not suffer him to put a *deceit* upon the *Reader*, especially in a matter where there could not accrue to him the least *advantage* or *convenience*. For 7. That that inestimable Bp. was, (in his most *mature* and *ripest* years) very *severe* to those *Doctrines* which are commonly called *Calvinistical*, is a thing so *known*, that I cannot think it will be *denied*. *Nulli nota magis domus est sua.*—— His solemn *Sermons* at the *Court* do often declare him to be *that*, which the *Ignorant* and the *Passionate* will call *Arminian*. Of which I do not torment my *Reader* with *Examples*, because I imagin, there cannot be the least need. But if my *Rd. Assailant* will have me, I will do it as soon as I know his *Pleasure*. At present I hasten to his *Conclusion*.

CHAP. XIII.

E. R.

I now conclude with answering your desire, which
 “was, that upon reading your Book, I would give
 “you my opinion of it. I have read it so well as
 “I

D. Reynolds his Confession Chap. 14.

"I could, a Copie not in all places alike plainly tran-
 "scribed. And truly, so far as my weakness is able
 "to judge, for the Theological and Argumentative
 "parts of it, it is so solid and substantial, as that I as-
 "sure my self, it will be very acceptable to many
 "learned men, and very useful to the Church of
 "God. You have therein given a good account to the
 "world, that you did converse with that second Brad-
 "wardine, D. Twisse unto very good purpose.
 "I heartily wish, that there may be no further
 "reciprocation of the Law of contention be-
 "tween you, but that Truth may so prevail, as that
 "you may become both one, both in opinion and Af-
 "fection. It will be a happy time with the Church of
 "God, when swords shall be beaten into Plowshares,
 " & spears into pruning hooks, when the earth shall
 "be so filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as that
 "all polemical writing shall be out of Date; when
 "the Lord shall be one, and his name one, and
 "we shall all serve him with one shoulder: Unto this
 "let all our writings tend, for this let all our pray-
 "ers contend. I commend your person & labours unto
 "God's Blessing, and remain,

Your most loving Friend

and Fellow-Labourer,

ED: REYNOLDS.

T. P.

T. P.

§. 1. **H**ERE is a palpable confession, that the *only* thing which was desired, is the *last* and *least* thing by him perform'd. Mr. Barlee courted his opinion concerning his *Correptory Correction*, and in the room of *that*, he hath told him his opinion of *other things*. I did never desire him to give me his opinion upon the reading of my *Notes*, nor did I expect that he should read them, much less did I desire him to declare his opinion to *all the world*, much less to declare it as much as *might* be to my *discredit*, much less to the *discredit* of Bp. Andrews, and the *Doctrines* by Him espoused; yet he hath turned over his *Books*, and made a *muster* of *Citations*, and spent almost his *whole Preface* in that which did not *belong* unto him, nor was at all desired of him, either by *me*, or my *angry Neighbour*. Which *why* should he do, if he had not a willingness to own his *Cause*, to gratifie his *Party*, to abett his *Fellow Labourer*, to show his *strength*, and to challenge *me* to an *Encounter*? I have answered his *Challenge* so much the rather, because I think him one of the *ablest* of those that *erre* on that *side*, and in the *conversion* or *confutation* of whom, the greatest good is to be done to them that read us; I had also more respect for a person of his *Fame*, then to affront him with a *contemptuous silence*; and a greater care of his *Orthodoxie*, then to suffer him to live in such a dangerous mistake, as to believe his *Epistle unanswerable* in case it were *unanswered*. For as soon as he had *wished*, and *wished heartily*, that there might be no further reciprocation of the law of contention, he immediately added, [*but that truth might so prevail &c.*] Upon which I considered within my self, that if I had not made him some *return* to his *Assault*, he might have imagin'd, that *Truth* had been on *his side*, and have ascribed *both* the *patience*, and the *modesty* of my *silence*, unto the *prevalence* of that which he is pleased to call *Truth*.

Let

Let this suffice for his confessed *misapph.*

Correp. Cor.
p. 35.

§. 2. Secondly, He next goes on to encourage his *Fellow-Labourer* with some *applause* and *commendation*, which his *Fellow-Labourer* had earned of him by quoting a passage of his *Sermon* preached before the *Lord Maior*, taking that occasion to call him *the Eminent and sweet Dr. Χρὸς Χρῆστος*. First, he commends the *Theological* and *argumentative parts* of his Book, (which he did well to distinguish from the *scurrilous* and *Invective*,) as very acceptable to many *learned men*, and very useful to the *Church of God*. How directly contrary this is to the real merit of the thing, I have partly shewed already, and can do in greater abundance when my *Rd. Assailant* shall call me to it. If to teach a *wicked world*, that *God doth tempt men unto sin*, that he *predestins*, and *stirrs them up* to that which is *unlawful*, that his *will and Decree of mens sins* is *efficacious and absolute*, if not a few, but a *multitude* of such like *Doctrines*, (which have made so many *Ranters* and *Libertines* in *Christendom*, to the great *scandal* of the *heathen* and the *dishonour* of *Christianity*) is acceptable to the *learned*, or useful to the *Church*, then the *Correptory Corréctor* hath highly deserved his commendations. And let that suffice for a *specimen* of his *Theological* performances, which if I listed to pursue in all the particulars that I have noted, they would make a *new Volume* with too much *ease*. Of his *argumentative faculty* (which is the second thing commended) I will also give no more then one or two *Tasts*. It being a part of his *Theologie*, that though a *Saint* may be guilty both of *Murder* and *Adultery*, with a *complication* of other *sins*, and continue in them for some time *without repentance*, yet that *Saint* cannot be possibly (no, not at that very time) in a *state of Damnation*, he seeks an *argument* to prove it from the *Case of * David*, who though (b) *deliberately* guilty of *Adultery*, and with the *wife of Uriah*, one of the *loyallest* of all his subjects, and added (c) *drunkenness* to *thirst*, and though when that would not take, he endeavoured to conceal it by (d) *wilful murder*, and by the murder of

most

* Correp. Corr.
p. 221. 222.
b 2 Sam. 11.
2. 3. 4.
c vers. 13.
d vers. 15.

most excellent Uriah, to whom he was very much obliged, and whom he had wronged too much already, though he continued in these sins without remorse, adding a deep (e) *Dissimulation* and *Hypocrisie*, and instead of *repenting*, e vers. 25. took possession (f) of *Bathsheba*, (as *Ahab* did of *Naboth's* f vers. 27. Vineyard,) never crying *peccavi* till (g) after the message of g chap. 13, 13. *Nathan*, yet he was not all this while in a state of *Damnation*, saith * Mr. Barlee; who farther tells us, that *David* was not *fallen* from the state of *salvation*, but from the joy of it; and that he had not, even then, lost the *holy Spirit* of God. But because all this is but the *beginning* of his *Question*, he endeavours to prove it by several *Arguments*; first from the suffrage of *Bertius*, that very same *Bertius* whom he calls *Apostate*, and who was called a *Blasphemer* by learned King James (as my *Assailant* saith.) And though he doth not (h) name the place where *Bertius* is of his judgment in this particular, yet that is his first proof, the *Concession* of *Bertius*. Secondly, he adds his *misapprehension* and strange abuse of that Text of Scripture *Psal. 51. 11.* which, every child knows, was penn'd by *David* after the time of his *Repentance*. Thirdly, he adds, that if *this* had not been true (which was said by him and *Bertius*) *David* after his fall must have been *circumcised* again, and (to give the *Anabaptists* as much advantage as he is able) he adds to that also, that all *Christians* at any time falling into enormous sins, must be baptized again. Fourthly, he argues, that † *Drunken Dick* *Tompson* did also maintain † So he rec- a falling damnably from *Grace*, meaning a *Total*, though not viles that ex- a final Fall, whereas he and his party do not believe either traordinary of them; but only they say (putting it off with that *Trick*) Person, (now that whensoever any man falls into any sin, he falls damnably, we ought in that is, so as to deserve *Damnation*, which is the same that charity not to question?) whom Bp. Abbot himself commended, if not admired, as a very great and learned man, even in that very book which he writ against him. Who if he was possibly overtaken, with *Lor*, and *Noah*, in drinking wine, yet he repented with *Lor*, and *Noah*; Nor was he ever known, in all his life, to play the *Correptory* *Correptor*.

* Note, that Mr. Simson's Doctrine; which was in substance the same with this, was condemned as a Blasphemy by Mr. Cawdrey, and above 50 Ministers besides of the same way, in their book intitled, *A Testimony to the truth of Jesus christ.* p. 16. Nor was D. Crisp's much unlike it in the same page.

h He only refers to the whole book de Apostasia Sanctorum.

he faith of all the whole Masse in *Adam's Loynes*. Now from the Doctrine of Mr. B. thus argued, they that are so shallow may make a very sad use. For having first swallowed it down, as an unquestionable thing, that they are vessels of a most absolute unconditional Election, and that they cannot fall totally, much less finally from Grace; in so much that although they commit Adultery or Murder, or whatsoever sins besides, and live indulgently in them for no small time, as David did, without Repentance, yet they have not

† See how this dangerous Error is detested by good Melancthon loc. Com. de bon. oper. 169. 179. 180. De discrim. pec. mort. et ven. p. 228. manifestus error, & necessario reprehendendus — nec confirmemus in stultis securitatem & cæcitatem. — nec fingamus Deum saxæum & stœicum — stœica illæ disputationes execranda sunt, Elestos semper retinere spiritum sanctum. De pecc. Actualibus. p. 83, 84. k k Correp. Corr. p. 221. lin. 22, 23, 24, 25.

† See how mischievous that Doctrine is in the opinion of King James and Dr. Overall at the Conference at Hampton-court. p. 20, 31. especially p. 42, 43. * Correp. Corr. p. 222. lin. 11, 12, 13.

† lost the Holy Ghost, nor can be possibly in a state of Damnation, they will immediately conclude, that all the sins they can commit are not able to do them any considerable discourtesie; they may make them the sadder, but not the worse; some what lesse cheerful, but not lesse safe; they can fall no otherwise then David did, that is (saith their Teacher Mr. Barlee) (k) not from the state of salvation, but only from the joy of it, and therefore they need not be (k) rebaptized. And if they can

but sin merrily, as not discerning the guilt, or not fearing the danger, they shall not fall so much as from the joy of their salvation, Now, Reader, judge by this Taste, of this writers Theological, argumentative parts, and how † useful they are to the Church of God. I will give another Taste of him whilst it is now under my eye. Because I said in my Notes, that none were Elested unto Blisse under any other notion then that of being foreseen from all eternity to be found to be in Christ, and persevering in Christ unto the end, Mr. Barlee affirmeth me to have said, That no man is elested until he hath persevered in faith and repentance, which cannot be till he is dead. As if when I spake of God's Decree, which I there proved to be respektive, and expressly distinguished it from its execution, I could have placed the Decree after the time of its execution. But He having had so little Grace as to invent such a Calumny, had withall so little wit as to cite my 69 page, as the place where he pretends that I had

had spoken *these words*; that so every Reader who will but consult the *place cited*, might stand amazed at the *strangeness* of that *invention*. Nor can he and Mr. *Whitfield* pretend to an *Ignorance* in their *excuse*, unless by confessing that they could not apprehend, how God should eternally foresee as well the *means*, as the *end*; as well the *Sin*, as the *Damnation*; as well the *Faith* and *Perseverance*, as the *life after death*. And this may suffice for a second Taste of Mr. *B's* *Argumentations*, and of their *usefulness* to the *Church of God*.

§ 3. He is next commended by his *Encmias*t, for having conversed with Dr. *Twisse*, that second *Bradwardine*, unto very good purpose. Which is as much as to say, that he hath shewed himself able to write and read. For all the use he hath made of Dr. *Twisse*, is to transcribe a great deal of him, sometimes nothing to his purpose, sometimes against it. Indeed Dr. *Twisse* was as great an enemy to their way, and disputed against it as earnestly, as either of them can dispute against me. And the more they commend him as a second *Bradwardine*, an eminent servant of Christ, and the like, the more they do implicitly condemn themselves. Mr. *B.* hath done him the dishonour to speak well of him, to talk much of his *Friendship*, and to pretend that he loved him as another *Timothy*. No doubt he may have seen the Doctors face, which he describes to have been stern, p. 64.) but sure I am, he knowes but little of his meaning, more then what I have shew'd him, upon occasion of his mistakes.

My Reverend Adversary concludes with a hearty wish, that contention may cease, and Polemical writings be out of Date, that the Lord may be one and his name one (as the Scotsmen concluded the second Article of the Covenant.) But how heartily he wish'd it, and how much he hath contributed to the accomplishment of his wish, the Reader may easily passe a judgment, i. by his meddling in this matter of his own accord, confessedly beyond what was desired by Mr. *Bar-*

lee; 2. by his assaulting of me who never gave him the least degree of provocation; 3. by telling a *Correptory Corrector* (who needed a bridle and not a spur) that though soft words and hard Arguments are best, yet in writings of this Nature there may be a necessity of sharp Rebukes; 4. by forcing a Text of Scripture (*quasi obtorto collo*) to help to excuse the sharpness of a book, of which the common voice is, that it is perfectly unexcusable.

§. 4. I will also conclude with a hearty wish, (and which I verily believe is sincerely such) That we who are diverse at present, may after some short time be One in Judgment; Or if our Heads cannot be brought to an agreement, yet at least that God's Grace may be so prevalent in our Hearts, that whilst we are diverse in Judgment, we may be One in Love. That all the Hottest of our Contentions may be in order to conviction; and to the conviction of the Gainsayer, not by the ruine of his Person, but of his Argument and his Cause. Yet because there is an usual and easie passage, from breach of judgment, to breach of Charity, And because Agreement in Error is the sinew of Faction, but not of Peace; it concern's us to pray that we may endeavour, and to endeavour sincerely whilst we pray, That Truth as well as Unity, and Unity in the Truth, may be the only scope first, and then the only conclusion of our Debates. Were this obtained in Disputations, we should not finally change weapons, and passe à calamo ad gladium. We should persecute the Syllogisme, but not the Man; destroy his Error, but not his Family, or his Fortune. In the mean time it were well, if we would not think it a noble Consistency to persevere in that Opinion which first bespeak's us, nor blush at the Glory of confessing our former Errors, as soon as we see, and dislike them for having hurt us. For (to use the words of Mr. * Calvin concerning himself, and his publick works,

* Quorsum
enim vivere-

mus, si nihil atas, nihil usus, nihil assidue exercitatio, nihil lectio, nihil meditatio conferret? Calvin. de lib. arbit. contra Pighium.

which

which he professed an *Intention* to have reformed)
“wherein ly’s the benefit of growing older and older, if
“*Age*, and experience, and assiduous Exercising our selves
“added to Reading, and Meditation, did not conferr
“something on us, whereby to set us above the pitch of
our younger selves? I am resolved, for my part, not to be
longer of an Opinion, then I am able to see good reason
for it. And do so desire to try all things, as to hold fast
nothing but what is * good.

* 1 Thes. 5. 21.

The End.
